

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 5, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the valor and wisdom of our fathers, which gave to us civil, political, and religious liberty in a government of the people, by the people, for the people, that the peoples of the Western Hemisphere have followed their illustrious example. We thank Thee for the Pan American Scientific Congress, now convened in our National Capital. May its light go out to all the world and illumine the minds of the people and stimulate them to seek the hidden truths which lie around us. "What we know is nothing; what we don't know is immense." And we most fervently pray that the coming together of these representative men may strengthen and solidify the great Republics which they represent in the bonds of fraternity and brotherly love, "Each for all and all for each," under the spiritual leadership of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—H. R. 6236.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to Buford P. Moss, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is that a private bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is.

The SPEAKER. All the gentleman has to do is to change the reference and put it in the box. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] was to have an hour this morning.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Under a special order made yesterday the gentleman from Washington is recognized for one hour, to speak on the state of the Union.

OUR BATTLE-FIELD PROSPERITY.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to give notice to those who have the business of the House in charge that I shall probably not occupy the entire hour. Yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in announcing my subject gave me rather a broad one. As a matter of fact, I intend to talk to-day for a little while upon the present prosperity that this country is enjoying, and in order that I may get through and not seem to be discourteous I make the request now that I be not interrupted until I have finished what I have prepared.

Every time a new gun is sold to the warring nations of Europe, or a new shell is manufactured for them, or they give another order for an additional ton of powder, the Secretary of Commerce, the official, suave, prosperity "thimblerrigger" of the administration, issues a cheerful official bulletin that prosperity at last is coming. [Laughter on the Republican side.] He has issued these promising bulletins with feverish frequency ever since the Underwood law went upon the statute books. Almost daily he seeks to dispel the "psychological" gloom by declaring that business is looking up. It may be so, for business has been flat on its back, gazing at the stars, ever since this administration went into power, wondering if it will ever be able to stand erect again. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If business is improving it must have been bad. If it is looking up now it must have been looking down.

PROSPERITY, SPASMODIC AND TEMPORARY.

What are the true conditions to-day? Does prosperity prevail? When I was on the Pacific coast I was told that things were very prosperous in the East and Middle West. When I was in the Middle West I was told that business was very prosperous on the two coasts. When I reached the Atlantic I was told that business was very prosperous in the Middle West and on the Pacific. The fact about it is that the country to-day is blessed only with a local, spotted, temporary, spasmodic prosperity.

The Democratic Party is in ecstasies over it, poor as it is, transient as it is, coined from the greatest of calamities as it is, for it is the only prosperity that this Nation ever saw under a Democratic administration. Perhaps the Democrats are not to blame for claiming it, for they never had an opportunity to claim any kind of prosperity before. Our present condition, coming from an unexpected and tragic source, at a time when

the Democratic Party, in despair and gloom, was facing overwhelming defeat, has been a piece of political good fortune that has upset the Democratic mental equilibrium. That party to-day is completely befuddled. They think that the people can be deceived as to the facts. The Democratic Party to-day reminds me of an incident of Klondike days.

A day laborer went to that region of promise and disappointment. He worked with a shovel. In the meantime he staked a claim that was considered worthless. Like the Democratic Party, the sweet smile of accidental fortune came upon him. His claim yielded half a million dollars in gold. He secured this sum and, unannounced to friends or family, brought it to Seattle. He found his wife working at the washboard to support herself and three grown daughters. He determined that life's luxuries should no longer be denied them. He bought new dresses of latest fashion for mother and the girls and a white parasol for each, and thus arrayed, although it was mid-winter, he ordered a cab, and the family enjoyed a drive about the city—an indulgence which they had never before enjoyed or dreamed of. As they drove about the city the old gentleman sat on the driver's seat and pompously smoked two cigars at the same time. This was the first step of the delusion brought by his good fortune. Soon he became convinced that he had secured his fortune solely because of his great mental capacity and ability, and he was offended that his financial genius was not generally recognized.

The Democratic Party is passing through the first stage into the second. It is now confident that this temporary prosperity of misfortune is due solely to its wonderful achievements. The rest of the world knows it is entirely due to accident.

The war in Europe has compelled our competitors to become our best customers. It has compelled them to buy from us. It has compelled them to stop selling to us. The price of their existence has compelled them to do this. Our trade has increased but little with any nation not at war. It has decreased with most of them. Our export trade has increased enormously, but all that increase is measured exactly by the increased sales caused by the war.

We are selling to-day products to Europe made necessary on account of the war to the amount of \$300,000,000 a month—\$3,600,000,000 a year. Every forty days an amount sufficient to construct the Panama Canal. No such financial fortune ever before came to any nation of earth. It is brought by the accident and horrors of war. This is the basis—and the only basis—for all our prosperity, such as it is to-day. And this prosperity to-day exists, not because of the action of the Democratic administration but in spite of all its blundering and stupidity.

For the first time in the world's history we have heard the argument advanced that for us to be at peace and sell to our competitors vastly more than we ever sold them before, at higher prices than ever before, is a great industrial calamity to this country that only the genius of a Democratic administration could overcome.

Before this war in Europe broke out we had experienced nine months of the present free-trade tariff law and during that time there was a greater falling off of revenues, there were more business failures, more mills and factories closed, more men were thrown out of employment, more beggars and paupers were made, more idleness and want brought upon us, more demands were made upon charity to care for the cold and hungry than during any other nine months in our Nation's history, not excepting the days of starvation and rags under Grover Cleveland. [Applause on the Republican side.] The war in Europe has been a calamity to the race beyond human conception, but it has been the industrial salvation of this country. Our prosperity is entirely created by that indescribable tragedy. But for the war this Nation would to-day be suffering industrially beyond imagination and description. We would be in the midst of panic and poverty that would make the days of '93 to '97 look like greatest prosperity by comparison.

CERTAIN INDUSTRIAL INVASION.

When the millions of men now in the armies of Europe turn from pursuits of war to the pursuits of peace, when they leave the battle fields and return to the workshop and the mill and the mine and the farm, what, then, will be the effect upon our industrial condition?

When these millions, burdened with debt and struggling with poverty, when they cease to buy from us munitions of war, when they cease to buy from us the things that they eat and wear, when they begin to produce and produce more cheaply than ever before, when this mighty host becomes competitors instead of customers, then we will witness an industrial invasion of this country that will surpass all former industrial wars as the present war in Europe surpasses all others of history.

To meet this contest we are utterly helpless. For this contest we are making no preparation whatever. Against this invasion we have torn down every defense, destroyed every weapon and disarmed and discouraged every soldier.

We should prepare for war. We should be ready always to repel any invader. Upon this question all agree. The only reason that there is any difference of opinion in this country to-day upon the question of "preparedness" is because there is a difference of opinion as to the danger of invasion. But if we knew that we would be invaded, that about it there could be no question of doubt, then certainly no American but what would be in favor of most complete preparedness without a single day of delay. As certain as civilization endures, just that certain will we suffer an industrial invasion as soon as the struggle in Europe ends. Upon this question there can be no difference of opinion. What will be done in that day when our land is flooded with the products of cheap labor, when our mills and factories must close, and our land again becomes filled with the idle, hungry unemployed? If our present administration continues to conduct the affairs of the Government the suffering and poor in that day will again be fed with classic phrases upon "psychological" prosperity, they will be clothed with scholarly essays upon the beauties of free trade and the glories of new freedom and warmed with smug and smirking advice upon efficiency.

If our present tariff law remains upon our statute books a period of depression will begin in this country within 24 hours after peace is declared, and within 12 months after that time we will be in a period of panic and poverty never before equaled in our national experience. Then will the people of this country realize, what they now know, that our prosperity to-day is due to the war in Europe. To take no step to avert this certain disaster is treason against the American people.

If the party in power does not know this, then the price of their stupidity will be well-merited political oblivion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let us examine in detail this prosperity so exultingly proclaimed by the Democratic Party. Upon what foundation does it rest? What is its inspiration and its cause? Let us look upon the peaceful picture of prosperity this side of the ocean and then turn to the bloody picture upon the other and see if there is any relation between the two.

PROSPERITY OF THE FARMER.

They point to the prosperity of the farmer. True, we have the largest wheat crop in our history, and we have sold more to Europe than ever before. Our sale of wheat to Europe during the first year of the war compared with the first year of the present tariff law in time of peace increased from \$103,595,000 worth to \$316,262,000 worth, a gain of 205 per cent. Our wheat is used to feed the armies of Europe. But what was wheat worth in this country at the beginning of the war? To show the effect that the war has had upon our prosperity, let us take for comparison the year from September, 1913, to September, 1914, the year of peace and the first year of the Underwood law, and compare it with September, 1914, to September, 1915, the year of war and the second year of the Underwood law.

During the year of peace we sold in breadstuffs to Europe \$181,484,000 worth. In the year of war we sold \$567,607,000, a gain of 213 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe horses to the value of \$3,177,000. In the year of war we sold them horses to the value of \$82,276,000, a gain of 2,490 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe mules to the value of \$622,000. In the year of war we sold them mules to the value of \$18,041,000, a gain of 2,795 per cent.

During the year of peace we sold to Europe hay to the value of \$790,000. During the year of war we sold to Europe hay to the value of \$2,263,000, a gain of 233 per cent.

During the year of peace we sold to Europe meats and dairy products to the value of \$138,736,000. During the year of war we sold them meats and dairy products to the value of \$243,098,000, a gain of 75 per cent.

During the year of peace we sold to Europe sugar to the value of \$4,341,000. During the year of war we sold to Europe sugar to the value of \$36,816,000, a gain of 748 per cent.

Why should not the farmer of this country be prosperous when he is feeding the greatest armies that this world has ever seen? Does the Democratic Party think that there is a farmer in all America that can be deceived as to the reason of their present prosperity or that has forgotten the conditions that prevailed in this country the year before the war and the first year of the Underwood law upon our statute books?

MINES.

But we are told that the mines of this country are enjoying great prosperity also. It is true that we are selling vast quanti-

ties of the products of our mines to Europe. They are needed for war purposes.

Taking the same dates heretofore used—that is, from September, 1913, to September, 1914, the year of peace, and September, 1914, to September, 1915, the year of war—and official statistics tell a convincing story.

During the year of peace we sold to Europe \$12,870,000 worth of goods manufactured from aluminum, brass, lead, and zinc. In the year of war we sold of the same products to Europe of the value of \$66,730,000, a gain of 419 per cent. Zinc is necessary in the manufacture of shells. In this one item alone our sales increased from \$785,000 in the year of peace to \$26,323,000 in the year of war, a gain of 3,253 per cent. Is it necessary to stop to explain the reason for the prosperity of our mines?

MANUFACTURES.

They tell us, too, that our woolen mills are running, while many of them were closed down the first year of this Democratic tariff law. Is there an explanation?

In the year of peace we sold to Europe woolen goods to the value of \$4,753,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe woolen goods to the value of \$32,057,000, a gain of 574 per cent. Is any further demonstration needed as to the cause of the present condition of the woolen mills?

The leather industry, they inform us, is no longer depressed as it was before the war. Let statistics give the answer.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe men's shoes to the value of \$9,003,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe men's shoes to the value of \$22,669,000, a gain of 267 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe goods manufactured from leather to the value of \$43,390,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe goods manufactured from leather to the value of \$90,804,000, a gain of 109 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe harness and saddlery to the value of \$793,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe harness and saddlery to the value of \$18,434,000, a gain of 2,223 per cent.

Is there anything mysterious about the increased activity in the leather industry?

In the steel industry there has been great activity also. Steel is the one thing that enters more directly into the manufacture of munitions of war than perhaps any other. Look at the figures in regard to this industry.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe steel bars and billets to the value of \$7,590,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe of the same products to the value of \$21,743,000, a gain of 186 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe barbed and other wire to the value of \$7,472,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe barbed and other wire to the value of \$18,882,000, a gain of 153 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe firearms to the value of \$3,171,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe firearms to the value of \$11,591,000, a gain of 265 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe explosives to the value of \$6,244,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe explosives to the value of \$71,806,000, a gain of 1,050 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe medical appliances to the value of \$1,571,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe medical appliances to the value of \$5,218,000, a gain of 231 per cent.

In the year of peace we sold to Europe machine tools to the value of \$12,536,000. In the year of war we sold to Europe machine tools to the value of \$34,550,000, a gain of 175 per cent.

What of our automobile industry? The first year of the Underwood law drove many automobile establishments into bankruptcy. To-day they are running again. Let the figures answer why.

During the year of peace we sold to Europe automobiles and automobile tires to the value of \$34,000,000. During the year of war we sold to Europe automobiles and automobile tires to the value of \$92,000,000, a gain of 170 per cent.

During the year from September, 1913, to September, 1914, the year of peace under the present free-trade law, there were more idle cars rusting on the sidetracks of this country than ever before. But now these cars are moving again. They are carrying provisions down to the sea to be sent to the nations at war. Eliminate this business and the conditions of our railroads would be as bad as they were in the early part of 1914.

Our shipyards are busier than they have been for many years. But what are they doing? Building ships to carry supplies to the armies of Europe. Germany's great fleet of vessels is interned in the various ports of the world. Many vessels have been destroyed during the war. Never was there such a demand for shipping, but this is entirely due to the result of the contest in Europe.

THE CAUSE OF PROSPERITY.

Every industry in this Nation to-day that is enjoying even a normal degree of prosperity derives that prosperity from the awful tragedy that is now devastating the world. And official figures will demonstrate in every instance that this is true.

Our trade with Europe during the year from September, 1914, to September, 1915—the year of war—as compared with the year immediately preceding—the year of peace—increased in “war orders” alone over \$1,010,000,000.

The wayfaring man, though a fool, can look upon these figures and there will read the story of our present prosperity.

Every prosperous mill and mine, field, and factory, and workshop in this Nation to-day is directly connected by the sordid threads of gain with the blood-red battle fields of Europe. Cut these connections and our prosperity would wither as does the blossoming harvest before the hot winds of the desert. When the last echo of the last cannon shot dies in Europe then dies our present prosperity.

PROSPERITY OF WAR.

Where do the products of our present prosperity go to-day? Where are they used?

Go to Europe, visit the front, where is being waged the most costly and bloody struggle in all human history, and you will know. You ride out in an American automobile to the trenches dug with American tools, lined with American lumber, protected by American barbed wire, manned with American guns, filled with American ammunition, defended by men equipped, clothed, and fed with American products. American aeroplanes are scouting overhead, the cavalry dashes to the front on American horses, the light artillery is brought forward on American mules.

Wait until the lull of battle comes. Wait until the white flag of truce is flying, and then leave the trenches and walk forth upon that awful field of slaughter. Examine the dying, white-faced soldier as he is carried from the field of death. His cap is made from American material. His uniform from cloth made in America. His shoes are made in America. Remove them—his socks are made in America. His underclothes are made in America. His cartridge belt is made in America, filled with cartridges made in America. His knapsack is made in America. It is filled with provisions produced in America. From his dying grasp falls his gun made in America. His medicine case and contents are from America. Unwrap the bloodstained bandage of first aid; it is made in America. He is taken to the hospital in an American ambulance. There the angels of pity—the Red Cross nurses from America—soothe the agony of his dying hour. He takes American medicine. He is operated upon with American surgical instruments. The anesthetic of mercy is from America. He is carried to his last resting place upon an American stretcher, placed in a trench dug with an American pick, and the mound above his uncoffined form is heaped and rounded with an American shovel.

These are the surroundings and here is the hell where our present prosperity is coined.

Whatever we may think of the justification or the righteousness of our actions in selling to the warring nations, certainly there is no sane mind on all God's footstool but what regrets the conditions that causes us to do it.

I have no intention of criticizing those who sell to the warring hosts in Europe. That is not the question I am now considering. Those who sell them food and clothing may believe that they are performing not only a lawful act but one of humanity and mercy. Those who sell them guns and ammunition may believe that they are performing the greatest and noblest duty in placing means of defense in the hands of those whom they believe to be fighting for life, for liberty, for home, for all that is dearest and most sacred in human existence. Others may think that such acts are in the highest degree to be condemned, and believe that financial gain is the only motive. I am not passing judgment upon these acts. But to boast of gains secured from such conditions is abhorrent to all right-thinking human beings.

We might admire and applaud the physician that worked night and day for humanity in time of some great epidemic, even if he made money in so doing, but we would hate and despise him if he were to boast of the prosperity that he had coined from this human misery, and would consider him a sordid monster if he rejoiced at the calamity that brought him the opportunity. Whatever the justification of our acts for selling now at the rate of \$50,000,000 per week to the belligerents, we would have no admiration for anyone that would boast of the prosperity coming to us from such sales. We would look upon anyone who would be proud of such prosperity with something of the same feeling of horror as we would look upon the ghoul that would boast of the wealth that he had secured in the dark-

ness of the night by crawling his way over the field of death after the battle and robbing the dead and dying. We would have something of the same feeling of horror and disgust for anyone that would boast of this prosperity that we would have for the repulsive wretch that boasted of his wealth that consisted of the gold that he had extracted from the teeth of the grinning skeletons left as the grim relics of this awful destruction of human life.

Who will boast of the prosperity here that is measured by the blood and tears shed across the sea? Our prosperity is measured by the toll of human life taken from the armies of Europe. We want the prosperity of peace and not the prosperity of war. We want the prosperity that tells of happiness and content and joy, and not the prosperity of grief and anguish and despair. Our present prosperity is the prosperity of misery and misfortune. It is the prosperity of murder and passion. Our present prosperity is human life measured in money. Our present prosperity is coined from human hate, stained with human blood, mildewed with human tears, filled with human agony and despair, blackened with shattered hopes and ruined lives and marked and marred with tragic human death. I hope the terrible truth may be burned into the brain of the American people until no man will dare to boast of this battle-field prosperity. If the Democratic Party wishes to claim the credit for our present blood-soaked prosperity, then certainly there are none that desire to share that honor with it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FARLEY, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CONRY, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SCOTT, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry Wachter, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. KEATING, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 651) prescribing certain duties for carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk proceeded to call the list of committees.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. FERRIS (when the Committee on the Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 408, known as the water-power bill. It is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I think, Mr. Speaker, this bill is too important to be considered without an opportunity to talk more than five minutes on it.

Mr. FERRIS. And, pending that, I was going to try to see if we could agree upon the division of the time. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. There is no adequate amount of time allowed pending debate in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects, and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] in the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of

the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and in lieu thereof the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that in lieu thereof it be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. I object.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, there are certain salient provisions that I think every adequate water-power bill should contain. I shall try to enumerate them:

First. No legislation, Executive order, or departmental ruling should permit the patenting or the title in fee to pass out of the Federal Government under any conditions. The fee title should be reserved in perpetuity to the United States.

Second. The dam sites should be leased for a period of time not longer than 50 years, without any entangling alliances or phrases difficult to understand, on which the courts might quibble or debate as to the relative rights of the Federal Government and the lessee after the term has expired.

Third. The recapture provision should provide that all non-perishable property, such as land, water rights, dam sites, good will, and so forth, should go back to the Federal Government at actual cost, and that all perishable property in connection with the plant should come back to the Federal Government at the end of the lease at its fair value. In both cases the interest of the public is conserved and made certain.

Fourth. Strong, clear, well-understood provisions should be inserted in the lease contract for the revocation of the permit for a violation of the conditions thereof.

Fifth. Provisions should be inserted in the lease requiring diligence and prompt construction of the plant so that the property may not be held for speculative purposes.

Sixth. A royalty or rental for the use of dam sites and the property of the Federal Government should be required in all cases except for municipalities who furnish current to consumers without profit.

Seventh. The Federal Government should at all times maintain its paramountcy and full control.

Eighth. Annual reports should be exacted from the power companies, so that the public might at all times know of their acts and doings.

Ninth. The Federal Government should reserve to itself full power to fix rates for service, capitalization, bond issues, and so forth, in interstate projects and where there is no public utilities commission for this purpose in intrastate projects.

Tenth. Each lease, permit, or consent of Congress should contain a provision that upon proof that any such permittees, lessees, or grantees have conspired to prevent the development of water power or to limit the output of already constructed plants the lease should be revocable in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, section 1 of the pending bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to lease the reserved and unreserved Government lands of the United States, national parks excepted, for a term of not exceeding 50 years for the purpose of water-power development.

(a) The provision on page 2, from line 9 to 15, inclusive, requires the chief officer of the department who has jurisdiction over any of the reserve lands who finds that such lease for water-power and hydroelectric development will not injure or destroy or be inconsistent with the purposes for which the reservation was created. This is thought to be necessary to avoid conflict.

(b) The second provision of section 1, occurring on page 2 and within lines 16 to 20, inclusive, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant preference to applications for lease by States, counties, and municipalities when the applications are made for municipal uses and purposes. This is thought to be justice, for where a State, county, or municipality elects to develop hydroelectric power for their own use it is thought to be the highest use and in the interest of the public that they do not have to compete with some selfish corporation which might be able to marshal securities and become a more apt bidder therefor.

(c) The further provision in section 11, page 2, beginning in line 20 and including the remainder of the section, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue temporary permits which authorize the occupation of the land for water-power development for a period not exceeding one year to enable the applicant

to secure necessary engineering data, determine the feasibility of the project, and to finance the same; further, authorizing the extension of the one-year period when, in the discretion of the Secretary, unusual weather conditions or other conditions beyond the control of the applicant occur and make the same advisable. The advisability of this is apparent, due to the fact that much of this development has to be carried on on borrowed money. It requires time and engineering investigation to develop whether or not a project is feasible, whether or not the product can be disposed of, whether or not the money can be secured to develop it, whether or not water rights are in conflict, and, if so, time is required to purchase them. It is thought that such a provision and such authority vested in the Secretary is in the public interest and will bring about development of water-power resources; will not unduly tie up the property and cold storage it, so to speak, but will allow honest investors an opportunity to take the necessary preliminary steps looking to a final development of the property.

SECTION 2.

Section 2 provides that the lease shall contain a provision for the diligent, orderly, and reasonable development and continuous operation, subject to market conditions. Section 2 also enables the Secretary of the Interior, when he thinks it advisable, to put a provision in the lease denying to the operator or lessee the right to contract for the disposition of more than 50 per cent of the total output to any one consumer. It is thought to be of the highest importance that the lease, which is the original contract between the Government and the applicant, should bear all these provisions, which are almost sure to become more and more important during the life of the lease. It will also be observed that section 2 provides that the Secretary of the Interior may limit the amount of electrical energy that may be sold to any one person. It is thought wise to give him this power, but it was not thought the part of wisdom to make it mandatory. In some instances such a provision would be very helpful to ward off and break down monopoly where it exists, but where no monopoly exists it might be oppressive and unnecessary.

SECTION 3.

Section 3 provides that where hydroelectric power is generated in two or more States, the regulation and control of service and of charges for service to consumers and of the issuance of stock and bonds by the lessee is conferred upon the Secretary of the Interior or committed to such body as may be provided for by Federal statute. This is thought extremely advisable; otherwise, where electricity is generated in more than one State and State control is ineffective and inoperative, then and in that event it is thought to be the part of wisdom to confer upon the Secretary of the Interior power to regulate the same. It was also thought important to have the legislation indicate that the time might come when Congress in its wisdom might elect to confer this power either upon the Interstate Commerce Commission or some other Federal water power commission that Congress might create. Then, and in that event, the power of the Secretary of the Interior would cease, and such power step in and take control as Congress might provide.

The provision occurring on page 4, beginning at the end of line 4, is an antimonopoly provision, which authorizes combinations in the interest of efficient service, but expressly prohibits combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, expressed or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade with foreign nations or between two or more States or within any one State, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electrical energy or service. It will be observed that it is an extremely difficult task to properly regulate monopoly in connection with water power, for numerous instances can be cited when to allow combinations and union of effort and enterprise is found to be strictly in the interest of the public; but, of course, the general rule is otherwise, and it was the thought of the committee in dealing with this intricate question that the widest latitude should be given to the Secretary of the Interior, and that by experience and personal contact with the subject he could handle the matter more intelligently without too many fetters and restraints.

SECTION 4.

Section 4 provides that without the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior the lessee or power development company shall not sell or deliver power to a distributing company except in case of an emergency, and then only for a period not exceeding 30 days. It further provides that the lease shall not be assignable or transferable without the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

The provision occurring on page 4, section 4, line 17, expressly provides that the lessee shall be allowed to execute mortgages

or trust deed on the property for the purpose of financing the project. It expressly provides, however, that in the event of such transfer, whether voluntary or involuntary, it shall be subject to all the conditions of approval under which such rights were held as contained in the prior lease and in the act. This provision is thought to be imperative, due to the fact that much, if not quite all, of the development of hydroelectric energy must of necessity be done on borrowed capital, and it was not the wish of the committee to pass an act that would prevent financiers from financing the projects. It was the earnest wish of the committee and the proponents of this bill that the bill be made workable; that the bill be made attractive to capital, so that early and speedy development would occur, thereby reducing the cost of power to all who use it; and that the results intended would flow from the highest use of the natural resources bequeathed to us by nature.

SECTION 5.

Section 5 provides for the retaking of the property at the end of the lease, and indicates just how the property is to be retaken. In a word, it provides that all nonperishable property, which is sure to increase in value rather than decrease, such as lands, water rights, rights of way, and good will, the actual cost shall be paid therefor. The section further provides that all other property, such as structures, machinery, and so forth, that are apt to depreciate rather than increase in value, it is thought to be in the interest of the public to provide that the fair value shall be paid therefor, so that in retaking the property the public will not be forced to pay more than the property is actually worth. Your committee feels sure that section 5 lays down the correct rule for a retaking of the property.

The section contains a provision on page 5, line 21, which expressly provides that the reasonable value referred to shall not include or be affected by the value of the franchise or good will or profits to be earned on pending contracts or any other intangible element. It was the thought of the committee that this was clearly in the interest of the public. It was thought that it was but common justice that when we lease the property of the Government for a term of years the lessee should not be permitted to heap up the unearned increment, the good will, and other intangible elements that naturally go along with a business of this sort. It is the thought that the only thing that distinguishes a lease from a grant in perpetuity is the ability of the Federal Government to retake it. Therefore, it is the thought of your committee that this recapture provision of this bill or any other bill is of the highest importance and one that should be looked into carefully.

SECTION 6.

Section 6 lays down the three specific things that the Federal Government can do at the expiration of any lease made under this act. First, the Federal Government may retake it and operate it itself; second, it may renew the lease to the original lessee upon such terms and conditions and for such term as may be authorized under the then existing applicable laws; third, the Secretary of the Interior, upon the expiration of the lease, may lease the property of the original lessee to a new lessee upon such new conditions, new terms, and for such new periods of time as the applicable laws of that date authorize, providing that the new lessee shall pay for the property according to the rule laid down in section 5 of this act. It is the thought that section 6 makes it sufficiently clear that at the expiration of the term the Federal Government will have a free hand to do what it desires to do with the property. It is thought that anything short of this would be giving away more than the public or Congress would intend to do. This section 6 merely magnifies the necessity of an appropriate recapture provision; for example, if the Federal Government elected to lease the property to a new lessee, one of the first controversies that would arise would be, Can I secure possession of the property, and what is the rate I must pay for the property of the preceding lessee? If the method of recapture was simple, easy, plain, and well understood and on equitable grounds, so that the lessee would not have to pay for watered stock and inflated values, then and in that event prospective lessees for the property would be numerous, the rights would be valuable to the Government, and good results would flow in every direction.

But, on the other hand, if the method of recapture was onerous, complex, and difficult of understanding the rights of the Government would be of little or no value, applicants for the property would be few and hesitating, and the disaster that would come to the public by reason of such a provision would be that the original lessee would continue to hold the property and in all probability refuse to submit to new conditions, and while the Congress would have intended to issue a

lease, would have in fact and in reality issued a grant in perpetuity, a thing that this Congress does not desire and a thing that the American people will not in silence permit to be done.

SECTION 7.

This section contemplates the arising of a condition which would warrant the lessee in contracting for the supply of electrical energy beyond the term of his lease. In that event the section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, if he deems it for the public interest, to give his approval of the execution of such contracts, and in the event such approval is given the Government of the United States or the original lessee's successor is required to fulfill the term of the contract which extends beyond the life of the original lease. There will be a difference of opinion about the advisability of this section. It was the thought of your committee, however, that instances might arise where it would be highly necessary and important that the original lessee have more or less freedom in bidding for contracts in order to meet competition, and in some cases it might be necessary to go beyond the life of the lease. It is thought that the necessity for this is brought about by the fact that much of the water power potentiality is already in the hands of private persons, who of course can contract for service for terms indefinite in character. To not give the Government lessees under this act a fair opportunity to compete with the already entrenched water-power companies might be a burden and handicap on our Government lessees greater than we should inflict and might serve as an aid to power companies already entrenched, who would delight to longer be without competition and without additional development of electricity. I repeat, there will be a difference of opinion about this section, but the more the committee thought about it and the more we studied the situation the more we were convinced that to give the Secretary this power was sure to result in good, and the committee was unanimously of the opinion that it should be done.

SECTION 8.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the lessee and to specify in the lease such charge of rental for all power developed by the lessee for any purpose, as may be deemed appropriate in each individual case. The section further provides that the proceeds from such hydroelectric development shall be paid into the reclamation fund, and after it has been used by the fund for one term and returned to the reclamation fund, one-half of the moneys so returned shall be turned over to the States to be appropriated by the State legislature for the benefit of the public schools and other educational institutions or for public improvement, or for both, as the legislature may elect.

Under the reclamation act of 1902 all proceeds from the sale of Government lands goes into the reclamation fund, and inasmuch as the development of the water power on nonnavigable streams are on the public lands of the United States, it would seem proper that the returns should likewise go into the reclamation fund. Under the terms of the reclamation act the moneys so used for reclamation purposes in each instance become a lien upon the land and are later returned to the fund for disposition as Congress may provide. Hence, it is thought that until water power reaches a higher state of development and until more of the arid lands of the West have been irrigated it would seem advisable to use the proceeds for the further irrigation and development of the West and treat it as a fund derived from the sale of public lands.

The provision commencing in line 19, page 7, provides that where water power is generated by municipalities for municipal purposes only that such leases shall be executed by the Secretary of the Interior without rental or charge. It also provides that for development of not in excess of 25 horsepower leases may be issued to individuals or associations for mining or domestic uses without charge. It will be observed that this is a relaxation of the act where States, counties, or municipalities elect to construct, own, and operate their own light or power plant. It will be observed that the use is restricted for municipal purposes only and without profit.

It will further be observed that the small projects of less than 25 horsepower are used by individual settlers for pumping water and other domestic uses and that it was thought that it was not advisable for the Government to try to collect revenue therefrom. Many such minor plants are now in operation, and it was the thought of your committee that they should not be molested and that additional enterprises small in character would be advisable and without objection.

SECTION 9.

Section 9 is thought to be a provision which will insure regulation of hydroelectric power development within a State

where the State has refused or failed for any cause to provide for a public utilities commission which would have power to regulate rates, service, issuance of stock and bonds, and so forth, and until such time as the State creates such a commission the Secretary of the Interior would have power to regulate it. This is thought to be no invasion of State rights or no trampling upon the laws of the States, for if for any reason the regulation of an intrastate project by the Secretary of the Interior is offensive to them the matter could readily be obviated by the enactment of a law providing for a public utilities commission, and surely no one would advocate that where the State did not regulate that the Federal Government should likewise be precluded from regulation.

SECTION 10.

Section 10 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to allow lands that have been heretofore reserved for water-power purposes to be used for other and additional purposes, subject always to the superior right of the Government or its assignees to develop hydroelectric power thereon. It will be observed that many water-power sites have been withdrawn over the country under the Pickett Act of June 25, 1910. In some instances large areas were withdrawn, portions of which in all probability will not be necessary. It was therefore thought the part of wisdom to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow these lands to be used for other purposes, always reserving to the Federal Government the right of overflow and always subordinate to the superior use of hydroelectric development, and for this reason the section was incorporated. The provision in section 10, in line 4, page 9, provides that where locations, entries, or selections are filed or have been allowed the land shall proceed to patent, subject to a limitation to be inserted in the patent which shall preserve to the Federal Government all rights for power purposes.

SECTION 11.

Section 11 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to examine books and accounts of lessees, and to require them to submit statements, representations, or reports, including information as to cost of water rights, lands, easements, and other property acquired, production, use, distribution, and sale of energy, all of which statements, representations, or reports so required shall be upon oath and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require. It provides further that any person making any false statement, representation, or report under oath shall be subject to punishment as for perjury. It was the thought of your committee that as the Government was parting with this property for a long term of years that it ought to reserve to itself the right to know just what its lessees were doing with the property in each and every case, and it is thought that section 11 as written in the bill will accomplish that.

SECTION 12.

The section provides that whenever the terms of the lease are broken the lease may be canceled by a court of competent jurisdiction. There will be some difference of opinion as to whether the Secretary ought to have this summary power as distinguished from having it tried in a court, but the committee, after carefully considering it, was of the opinion that the lessee would have to incur such a large expense it was most too great a hazard to allow the lease to be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. It was thought more advisable to have it adjudicated in a court of competent jurisdiction, and to do otherwise, it was thought, would frighten away development and be disastrous to the highest development of water power.

SECTION 13.

Section 13 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. This gives the Secretary full power to make appropriate rules and regulations applicable to the circumstances in each project. It was thought that market conditions and other conditions will make the several projects widely differ, and it was thought best to give the Secretary of the Interior full power to make rules and regulations applicable to each individual case. It is apparently impossible and inadvisable to try to write into the statutes harsh general provisions which would be necessary in some instances and wholly inoperative and unworkable in others. The testimony of all the experts before the committee was to the effect that the greatest latitude should be given to the Secretary, so he can properly proceed in the widely differing cases.

SECTION 14.

Section 14 is a section disclaiming any intention on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with vested rights or the State laws with reference to water rights or the appropriate

distribution of water used for irrigation or municipal purposes. It is thought that water-power development ordinarily will not in any way interfere with the rights of the States, but this disclaimer has put any doubts to rest that may have arisen in the premises.

SECTION 15.

Section 15 repeals acts in conflict with the legislation under consideration and excepts certain acts of Congress which it is not desired to repeal.

The proviso on page 11, beginning with line 3, shall not be construed as revoking or as affecting any permits or valid existing rights of way heretofore given or granted pursuant to law, but at the option of the permittee any permit heretofore given for the development, generation, transmission, or utilization of hydroelectric power may be surrendered and the permittee given a lease for the same premises under the provisions of this act.

ESTIMATED POTENTIAL HORSEPOWER IN THE UNITED STATES.

The estimates for the developed and undeveloped potential horsepower of the United States range from 20,000,000 to 200,000,000 horsepower. A more conservative estimate ranges from 28,000,000 to 35,000,000 horsepower. Only 6,000,000 horsepower have been developed and are now in use. Estimated products for 1905 produced by hydroelectric power \$17,000,000,000, or seven times the total receipts of the railroads of the country.

LOCATION OF HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY BY GROUPS OF STATES.

North Atlantic group of States, 2,200,000 horsepower, or 7.9 per cent of the aggregate.

South Atlantic group of States, 2,300,000 horsepower, or 8.2 per cent of the aggregate.

North Central group of States, 1,700,000 horsepower, or 6 per cent of the aggregate.

South Central group of States, 1,500,000 horsepower, or 5.3 per cent of the aggregate.

Western group of States, 20,400,000 horsepower, or 72.6 per cent of the aggregate.

A later and more complete compilation of figures has been made up from estimates gathered by the Geological Survey in 1908 for the National Conservation Association, and later revised and brought up to date by the Commissioner of Corporations in his report on Water Power Developed in the United States, 1912. It is interesting to observe the amount of potential horsepower by States and the percentage each bears to the whole. It is interesting to observe that approximately 72 per cent of the whole amount of potential water power in the United States is in the western group of States, a large portion of which will come under the provisions of the bill now under discussion.

Feeling that the same will be of interest and of value, I insert them in the RECORD at this point, so that more accurate knowledge may be had as to the potential water power in the United States, in plain figures, both with a minimum and a maximum estimate:

TABLE NO. 1.—Potential water-power resources, minimum and maximum estimates of the several States and percentage relation, by States and by geographic divisions.

	Total potential water power.			
	Minimum.		Maximum.	
	Horse-power.	Per cent.	Horse-power.	Per cent.
New England:				
1. Maine.....	443,000	1.59	809,000	1.50
2. New Hampshire.....	135,000	.48	246,000	.46
3. Vermont.....	94,000	.33	172,000	.32
4. Massachusetts.....	118,000	.43	228,000	.42
5. Rhode Island.....	6,000	.02	13,000	.02
6. Connecticut.....	72,000	.26	137,000	.26
Middle Atlantic:				
7. New York.....	1,037,000	3.71	1,698,000	3.15
8. New Jersey.....	44,000	.16	106,000	.20
9. Pennsylvania.....	276,000	.99	684,000	1.27
East North Central:				
10. Ohio.....	59,000	.21	178,000	.33
11. Indiana.....	43,000	.16	118,000	.22
12. Illinois.....	192,000	.69	345,000	.64
13. Michigan.....	180,000	.64	293,000	.55
14. Wisconsin.....	358,000	1.28	670,000	1.24
West North Central:				
15. Minnesota.....	232,000	.83	494,000	.92
16. Iowa.....	160,000	.57	382,000	.71
17. Missouri.....	72,000	.26	163,000	.30
18. North Dakota.....	88,000	.31	207,000	.38
19. South Dakota.....	43,000	.16	75,000	.14
20. Nebraska.....	196,000	.70	366,000	.68
21. Kansas.....	111,000	.40	269,000	.50

TABLE No. 1.—Potential water-power resources, etc.—Continued.

	Total potential water power.			
	Minimum.		Maximum.	
	Horse-power.	Per cent.	Horse-power.	Per cent.
South Atlantic:				
22. Delaware.....	5,000	0.02	11,000	0.02
23. Maryland and District of Columbia.....	48,000	.17	133,000	.24
24. Virginia.....	492,000	1.76	870,000	1.61
25. West Virginia.....	881,000	1.86	1,051,000	1.95
26. North Carolina.....	678,000	2.07	875,000	1.62
27. South Carolina.....	460,000	1.64	677,000	1.25
28. Georgia.....	374,000	1.34	627,000	1.16
29. Florida.....	8,000	.03	13,000	.02
East South Central:				
30. Kentucky.....	83,000	.30	197,000	.37
31. Tennessee.....	463,000	1.66	761,000	1.41
32. Alabama.....	509,000	1.82	943,000	1.74
33. Mississippi.....	32,000	.11	63,000	.12
West South Central:				
34. Arkansas.....	22,000	.08	61,000	.11
35. Louisiana.....	1,000	.00	2,000	.00
36. Oklahoma.....	75,000	.27	208,000	.39
37. Texas.....	255,000	.91	551,000	1.02
Mountain:				
38. Montana.....	2,749,000	9.84	4,331,000	8.03
39. Idaho.....	2,362,000	8.45	5,067,000	9.40
40. Wyoming.....	773,000	2.76	1,305,000	2.42
41. Colorado.....	842,000	3.01	1,697,000	3.15
42. New Mexico.....	160,000	.57	439,000	.81
43. Arizona.....	893,000	3.20	1,698,000	3.15
44. Utah.....	743,000	2.66	1,318,000	2.45
45. Nevada.....	172,000	.62	276,000	.51
Pacific:				
46. Washington.....	4,932,000	17.65	8,647,000	16.04
47. Oregon.....	3,148,000	11.27	6,613,000	12.27
48. California.....	3,424,000	12.25	7,818,000	14.50
Recapitulation:				
49. New England.....	868,000	3.11	1,605,000	2.98
50. Middle Atlantic.....	1,357,000	4.86	2,458,000	4.62
51. East North Central.....	832,000	2.98	1,604,000	2.98
52. West North Central.....	902,000	3.23	1,956,000	3.63
53. South Atlantic.....	2,346,000	8.39	4,257,000	7.90
54. East South Central.....	1,087,000	3.89	1,964,000	3.64
55. West South Central.....	353,000	1.26	822,000	1.52
56. Mountain.....	8,694,000	31.11	16,131,000	29.92
57. Pacific.....	11,504,000	41.17	23,078,000	42.81
United States.....	27,943,000	100	53,905,000	100

It will doubtless be of interest to the House to know the amount of water power, steam power, and gas power in commercial central stations, municipal central stations, street and electric railways, and a few manufacturing plants for the year 1915. It is believed that the data for all except manufacturing plants is substantially complete. It is not asserted that the figures are complete for manufacturing plants, but only for the larger water-power developments employed in manufacturing. The best estimate as to the water-power development for all uses in the United States is considerably in excess of 6,000,000 horsepower. Of the total of 5,346,699 horsepower shown under the heading "Water power, all stations," 736,197 horsepower is used in manufacturing. The balance of 4,610,502 horsepower is strictly public-service use. The following table shows by States the total amount of water power, steam power, and gas power, first, by commercial central stations and similarly by municipal central stations. Of course, if a total of power for a given State is desired, it will be necessary to add together the amounts for the commercial central stations and the amounts for municipal central stations, if it is desired to be figured in horsepower, and if in kilo-volt-amperes, then it would be necessary to add the two columns together headed "Generators," which would give the total power in a given State by that method of measurement rather than by horsepower. It is as follows:

TABLE 2.—Primary power, water power, steam power, and gas power, 1915, in horsepower and generator capacities in kilowatt amperes, in commercial and municipal central stations, street and electric railways, and a few manufacturing plants.

(By States and by geographic divisions.)

	Commercial central stations.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
New England:					
1. Maine.....	103,221	33,871	155	137,247	81,933
2. New Hampshire.....	48,815	1,695	81,880	45,734	45,734
3. Vermont.....	84,963	22,171	989	108,123	70,981
4. Massachusetts.....	119,287	385,439	1,507	506,233	365,858
5. Rhode Island.....	2,485	90,710	1,625	94,820	45,295
6. Connecticut.....	41,910	101,099	75	143,084	104,689

TABLE 2.—Primary power, water power, steam power, etc.—Continued.

	Commercial central stations.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
Middle Atlantic:					
7. New York.....	587,637	812,206	6,306	1,406,149	997,731
8. New Jersey.....	9,835	305,585	1,710	317,130	221,283
9. Pennsylvania.....	167,862	598,162	9,585	775,609	571,704
East North Central:					
10. Ohio.....	19,773	555,674	5,938	581,385	436,321
11. Indiana.....	7,891	277,361	2,960	288,212	221,189
12. Illinois.....	48,650	806,736	3,852	859,238	628,363
13. Michigan.....	186,289	287,788	748	474,825	329,960
14. Wisconsin.....	155,930	177,540	7,268	340,738	219,248
West North Central:					
15. Minnesota.....	213,495	124,560	1,597	339,652	222,102
16. Iowa.....	158,721	129,891	1,442	290,054	239,769
17. Missouri.....	20,590	241,330	3,069	264,989	212,891
18. North Dakota.....	80	15,477	706	16,263	12,194
19. South Dakota.....	12,595	14,115	17,963	44,673	23,961
20. Nebraska.....	5,674	47,174	2,516	55,364	39,623
21. Kansas.....	11,563	63,080	4,544	79,187	52,041
South Atlantic:					
22. Delaware.....	54	16,300	250	16,604	11,725
23. Maryland and District of Columbia.....	2,539	203,650	505	206,694	151,849
24. Virginia.....	70,275	87,899	310	158,484	112,023
25. West Virginia.....	7,637	102,453	2,825	112,920	89,809
26. North Carolina.....	91,183	69,333	1,750	162,266	110,259
27. South Carolina.....	206,612	36,450	243,062	162,161
28. Georgia.....	203,406	96,574	299,980	215,680
29. Florida.....	7,030	25,685	1,165	33,880	23,361
East South Central:					
30. Kentucky.....	71,090	1,035	72,125	53,284
31. Tennessee.....	97,535	68,824	80	166,439	129,074
32. Alabama.....	81,784	68,864	150,648	122,909
33. Mississippi.....	31,780	100	31,880	30,129
West South Central:					
34. Arkansas.....	2,200	44,857	245	47,302	31,377
35. Louisiana.....	76,784	2,335	79,119	71,370
36. Oklahoma.....	1,400	41,513	5,500	51,413	37,596
37. Texas.....	6,552	190,105	13,347	210,004	157,450
Mountain:					
38. Montana.....	189,405	30,353	75	219,833	137,237
39. Idaho.....	148,410	9,430	500	158,340	111,785
40. Wyoming.....	2,364	14,345	20	16,729	11,180
41. Colorado.....	82,925	80,353	130	163,408	103,455
42. New Mexico.....	552	12,660	13,212	12,362
43. Arizona.....	33,630	53,655	870	88,155	61,802
44. Utah.....	87,872	29,164	117,036	76,322
45. Nevada.....	13,150	2,600	744	16,494	12,078
Pacific:					
46. Washington.....	265,491	78,404	166	344,061	232,999
47. Oregon.....	120,362	60,949	250	181,561	110,835
48. California.....	676,425	461,917	2,055	1,140,397	778,332
Recapitulation:					
49. New England.....	400,681	664,660	6,046	1,071,387	714,490
50. Middle Atlantic.....	765,334	1,715,953	17,601	2,498,888	1,790,718
51. E. North Central.....	418,533	2,105,069	20,766	2,544,368	1,831,081
52. W. North Central.....	422,718	635,627	31,837	1,090,182	802,581
53. South Atlantic.....	588,736	638,349	6,805	1,233,890	876,847
54. E. South Central.....	179,319	240,558	1,215	421,092	335,396
55. W. South Central.....	10,152	356,250	21,427	387,838	298,093
56. Mountain.....	558,308	232,560	2,339	793,207	526,211
57. Pacific.....	1,062,278	601,270	2,471	1,666,019	1,122,166
United States.....	4,406,059	7,190,335	110,507	11,706,901	8,297,583

Municipal central stations.

	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
New England:					
1. Maine.....	1,996	805	2,801	1,450
2. New Hampshire.....	600	545	1,145	700
3. Vermont.....	4,910	1,830	6,740	4,347
4. Massachusetts.....	1,270	31,573	980	33,823	21,166
5. Rhode Island.....
6. Connecticut.....	10,135	755	10,890	6,450
Middle Atlantic:					
7. New York.....	2,005	8,581	1,390	11,976	7,945
8. New Jersey.....	112	2,770	115	2,997	2,255
9. Pennsylvania.....	538	13,739	1,810	16,087	11,663
East North Central:					
10. Ohio.....	175	53,450	2,309	55,934	39,839
11. Indiana.....	200	28,980	285	29,465	22,580
12. Illinois.....	20,706	200	20,906	13,661
13. Michigan.....	10,972	41,492	687	53,151	38,966
14. Wisconsin.....	3,143	13,809	1,225	18,177	12,656
West North Central:					
15. Minnesota.....	1,399	19,896	2,303	23,598	17,561
16. Iowa.....	710	14,517	1,593	16,822	11,724
17. Missouri.....	19,331	170	19,501	14,193
18. North Dakota.....	2,420	242	2,662	1,703
19. South Dakota.....	1,420	936	2,356	1,645
20. Nebraska.....	5,050	12,490	1,921	19,461	14,073
21. Kansas.....	125	22,160	4,172	26,457	17,381
South Atlantic:					
22. Delaware.....	1,535	1,535	1,000
23. Maryland and District of Columbia.....	2,533	2,533	2,595

TABLE 2.—Primary power, water power, steam power, etc.—Continued.

	Municipal central stations.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
South Atlantic—Contd.					
24. Virginia.....	6,124	6,278	12,402	7,703
25. West Virginia.....	1,600	1,600	155	1,755	824
26. North Carolina.....	1,035	8,923	9,958	7,176
27. South Carolina.....	4,625	4,625	3,680
28. Georgia.....	500	16,127	16,627	11,442
29. Florida.....	12,697	12,697	9,628
East South Central:					
30. Kentucky.....	7,730	7,730	6,131
31. Tennessee.....	300	6,421	225	6,946	5,250
32. Alabama.....	682	6,532	15	7,529	5,430
33. Mississippi.....	10,473	150	10,623	7,546
West South Central:					
34. Arkansas.....	5,132	130	5,262	3,771
35. Louisiana.....	7,206	855	8,061	5,824
36. Oklahoma.....	358	11,573	855	12,786	8,687
37. Texas.....	225	6,925	324	7,474	5,845
Mountain:					
38. Montana.....	1,005	1,005	700
39. Idaho.....	1,350	1,350	600
40. Wyoming.....	40	335	36	411	227
41. Colorado.....	975	2,775	3,750	2,317
42. New Mexico.....	300	385	685	485
43. Arizona.....	50
44. Utah.....	7,151	650	7,801	4,757
45. Nevada.....
Pacific:					
46. Washington.....	54,510	13,450	67,960	41,010
47. Oregon.....	4,646	210	32	4,888	2,815
48. California.....	45,700	12,000	57,700	40,315
Recapitulation:					
49. New England.....	8,776	44,888	1,735	55,399	34,113
50. Middle Atlantic.....	2,655	25,090	3,315	31,060	21,863
51. E. North Central.....	14,490	158,437	4,706	177,633	127,702
52. W. North Central.....	7,284	92,234	11,342	110,860	76,280
53. South Atlantic.....	7,659	54,318	155	62,132	44,198
54. E. South Central.....	982	31,456	390	32,828	24,357
55. W. South Central.....	583	30,836	2,164	33,583	24,127
56. Mountain.....	9,516	5,065	421	15,002	9,136
57. Pacific.....	104,856	25,660	32	130,548	84,140
United States.....	156,801	467,984	24,260	649,045	447,916

NOTE.—The term "steam power" includes steam engines and steam turbines; "water power" water wheels, turbines, and motors; and "gas power," internal-combustion engines using either gas or oil fuel.

	Street and electric railways and manufactures. ¹				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
New England:					
1. Maine.....	172,372	26,595	198,967	18,069
2. New Hampshire.....	59,000	7,410	66,410	3,481
3. Vermont.....	28,016	2,975	30,991	2,340
4. Massachusetts.....	33,128	228,957	850	262,935	162,936
5. Rhode Island.....
6. Connecticut.....	38,670	38,670	22,435
Middle Atlantic:					
7. New York.....	209,888	639,206	2,661	851,755	429,718
8. New Jersey.....	19,455	19,455	12,532
9. Pennsylvania.....	133	203,122	110	203,365	138,861
East North Central:					
10. Ohio.....	112,168	250	112,418	79,025
11. Indiana.....	8,195	8,195	7,200
12. Illinois.....	5,751	32,830	38,581	22,879
13. Michigan.....	15,850	58,836	74,686	50,350
14. Wisconsin.....	74,496	8,385	900	83,781	7,100
West North Central:					
15. Minnesota.....	39,364	14,867	54,231	11,326
16. Iowa.....	9,350	9,350	6,450
17. Missouri.....	80	42,500	42,580	29,180
18. North Dakota.....
19. South Dakota.....	458	458	275
20. Nebraska.....	75	23,775	40	23,890	15,925
21. Kansas.....	1,250	2,900	4,150	6,755
South Atlantic:					
22. Delaware.....
23. Maryland and District of Columbia.....	750	10,070	10,820	7,110
24. Virginia.....	17,830	19,630	37,460	22,424
25. West Virginia.....	16,150	540	8,035	24,725	6,875
26. North Carolina.....	6,887	1,515	8,402	452
27. South Carolina.....	20,400	5,950	26,350	3,400
28. Georgia.....	13,649	7,350	20,999	7,560
29. Florida.....	1,150	1,150	937
East South Central:					
30. Kentucky.....	48,030	48,030	29,150
31. Tennessee.....	13,900	13,900	8,800
32. Alabama.....	1,920	1,920	700
33. Mississippi.....
West South Central:					
34. Arkansas.....	850	850	600
35. Louisiana.....	160	3,500	3,660	2,210

¹ Totals include 736,197 water horsepower and 172,210 steam horsepower, total 908,407 horsepower used in manufactures.

TABLE 2.—Primary power, water power, steam power, etc.—Continued.

	Street and electric railways and manufactures.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
West South Central—Con.					
36. Oklahoma.....	5,980	330	6,310	4,865
37. Texas.....	5,755	400	6,155	4,832
Mountain:					
38. Montana.....	13,490	1,260	14,750	2,665
39. Idaho.....	2,600	70	2,670	1,310
40. Wyoming.....	140	200	340	372
41. Colorado.....	8,403	18,780	27,183	17,937
42. New Mexico.....
43. Arizona.....
44. Utah.....	1,711	1,800	3,511	1,956
45. Nevada.....	170	9,775	9,945	4,750
Pacific:					
46. Washington.....	11,133	1,800	12,933	8,103
47. Oregon.....	31,755	3,500	35,255	2,306
48. California.....	72,950	60	73,010	55,860
Recapitulation:					
49. New England.....	292,516	304,607	850	597,973	209,281
50. Middle Atlantic.....	210,021	861,783	2,771	1,074,575	581,111
51. East North Central.....	96,097	220,414	1,150	317,661	166,554
52. West North Central.....	39,977	91,742	2,940	134,659	69,911
53. South Atlantic.....	75,666	45,055	9,185	129,906	48,758
54. East South Central.....	63,850	63,850	38,650
55. West South Central.....	160	16,085	730	16,975	12,507
56. Mountain.....	26,514	31,885	58,399	28,990
57. Pacific.....	42,888	78,250	60	121,198	66,269
United States.....	783,839	1,713,671	17,686	2,515,196	1,222,031

	All stations.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
New England:					
1. Maine.....	277,589	61,271	155	339,015	101,452
2. New Hampshire.....	108,415	39,325	1,695	149,435	49,915
3. Vermont.....	117,889	26,976	989	145,854	77,668
4. Massachusetts.....	153,635	645,969	3,337	802,991	549,960
5. Rhode Island.....	2,485	90,710	1,625	94,820	45,295
6. Connecticut.....	41,910	149,904	830	192,644	133,594
Middle Atlantic:					
7. New York.....	799,530	1,459,993	10,857	2,269,880	1,435,394
8. New Jersey.....	9,947	327,810	1,825	339,582	236,070
9. Pennsylvania.....	168,533	815,023	11,605	995,061	722,228
East North Central:					
10. Ohio.....	19,948	712,292	8,497	749,737	555,185
11. Indiana.....	8,091	314,536	3,245	325,872	250,969
12. Illinois.....	54,401	860,272	4,052	918,725	664,903
13. Michigan.....	213,111	898,116	1,435	1,112,662	745,276
14. Wisconsin.....	233,569	199,734	9,393	442,696	239,004
West North Central:					
15. Minnesota.....	254,258	159,323	3,900	417,481	250,989
16. Iowa.....	159,431	153,758	3,037	316,226	237,943
17. Missouri.....	20,670	303,161	3,239	327,070	256,264
18. North Dakota.....	80	17,897	948	18,925	13,897
19. South Dakota.....	13,053	15,536	18,899	47,488	25,881
20. Nebraska.....	10,799	83,439	4,480	98,718	69,621
21. Kansas.....	11,688	86,490	11,616	109,794	76,177
South Atlantic:					
22. Delaware.....	54	17,835	250	18,139	12,925
23. Maryland and District of Columbia.....	3,289	216,253	505	220,047	161,554
24. Virginia.....	94,229	113,807	310	208,346	142,150
25. West Virginia.....	23,787	104,508	11,015	139,400	97,508
26. North Carolina.....	99,105	79,771	1,750	180,626	117,887
27. South Carolina.....	227,012	47,025	274,037	169,191
28. Georgia.....	217,565	120,051	337,606	234,662
29. Florida.....	7,030	38,382	2,315	47,727	33,926
East South Central:					
30. Kentucky.....	126,850	1,035	127,885	88,565
31. Tennessee.....	97,835	89,145	305	187,285	143,124
32. Alabama.....	82,466	77,616	15	160,097	129,039
33. Mississippi.....	42,253	250	42,503	37,675
West South Central:					
34. Arkansas.....	2,200	50,839	375	53,414	35,748
35. Louisiana.....	160	87,490	3,190	90,840	79,404
36. Oklahoma.....	1,758	62,066	6,685	70,509	51,448
37. Texas.....	6,777	202,785	14,071	223,633	168,127
Mountain:					
38. Montana.....	202,895	32,618	75	235,588	140,602
39. Idaho.....	152,360	9,500	500	162,360	113,705
40. Wyoming.....	2,544	14,880	56	17,480	11,739
41. Colorado.....	92,303	101,908	130	194,341	123,709
42. New Mexico.....	553	12,960	385	13,897	12,847
43. Arizona.....	33,630	55,655	870	89,155	61,852
44. Utah.....	96,734	31,614	128,348	83,035
45. Nevada.....	13,320	12,375	744	26,439	16,823
Pacific:					
46. Washington.....	331,134	93,654	166	424,954	282,112
47. Oregon.....	156,763	64,659	282	221,704	115,956
48. California.....	722,125	546,867	2,115	1,271,107	874,607

TABLE 2.—Primary power, water power, steam power, etc.—Continued.

	All stations.				
	Water power.	Steam power.	Gas power.	Total power.	Generators.
Recapitulation:					
49. New England.....	701,973	1,014,155	8,631	1,724,759	957,884
50. Middle Atlantic.....	978,010	2,602,826	23,687	3,604,523	2,393,692
51. East North Central.....	529,120	2,483,950	26,622	3,039,692	2,125,337
52. West North Central.....	469,979	819,603	46,119	1,335,701	950,772
53. South Atlantic.....	672,061	737,723	16,145	1,425,928	969,803
54. East South Central.....	180,301	335,864	1,605	517,770	398,403
55. West South Central.....	10,895	403,180	24,321	438,396	334,727
56. Mountain.....	594,338	269,510	2,760	866,608	564,337
57. Pacific.....	1,210,022	708,180	2,563	1,917,765	1,272,575
United States.....	5,346,699	9,371,990	152,453	14,871,142	9,967,530

NOTES.—This table summarizes the data shown in detail on succeeding pages. The term "steam power" includes steam engines and steam turbines; "water power" includes water wheels, turbines, and motors; and "gas power" includes internal combustion engines using either gas or oil fuel.

TWO KINDS OF WATER POWER.

First, water power developed on the navigable streams of the country, more or less interlinked with navigation.

Second, water power developed on the nonnavigable streams where the Federal Government owns the dam site or the public lands over which the rights of way must traverse. The Adamson bill had to do with the former, this bill has to do with the latter.

WATER POWER A PUBLIC UTILITY.

There was a time when water-power development was considered a local, private enterprise in which only the local com-

munity was interested and only the local community had to do with its regulation. This theory has long since been exploded, and it is now generally admitted to be a public utility by all who have had occasion to study the subject.

Water power was once considered a private snap, but it is now one of the greatest modern agencies used in the development of this country. It will be interesting to the House to know that the total output of products manufactured by water power in this country in a single year amounted to \$17,000,000,000. It will again be interesting to know that this is seven times more than the combined receipts of all the railroads of this country.

In the debate last year quite a good deal was said as to the concentration in the control, development, distribution, and sale of electric power. Nearly every author who writes on the subject attempts to treat it, most every speaker in and out of the House makes some reference to it. It seems to me of transcendent importance that the House know of the best available figures, prepared by the Geological Survey, the Census Bureau, and the Bureau of Corporations, and compiled and arranged by the water-power divisions of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, and for which assistance I at this time desire to make grateful acknowledgment.

I repeat, it seems to me that the House ought to have the benefit of the best figures on the subject, showing, by States, first, who owns the water power in the several States; second, how many electric stations there are in each of the several States; third, the total amount of water power in the several States; fourth, the total amount of steam power there is in each State; fifth, the total amount of power, all told; and sixth, the individual percentages in each State.

I incorporate at this point, as a part of my remarks, these figures, believing that they will be of value to any student of the water-power subject, or to anyone else who cares to hurriedly look up a given proposition.

It is as follows:

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.

[NOTE.—References are to the detail sheets following these summary tables.]

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
ALABAMA.											
4	Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co.....	7	72,500	18,920	91,420	72,500	91,420	87.9	57.1	87.9	57.1
30	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut.....	1		16,300	16,300	72,500	107,720		10.2	87.9	67.3
36	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	1		9,330	9,330	72,500	117,050		5.8	87.9	73.1
23	Doherty Operating Co.....	1	5,000	3,420	8,420	77,500	125,470	6.1	5.3	94	78.4
41	West Point Manufacturing Co.....	2	3,950	4,200	8,150	81,450	133,620	4.8	5.1	98.8	83.5
31	Montgomery Light & Traction Co.....	1		6,670	6,670	81,450	140,290		4.2	98.8	87.7
33	The Sheffield Co.....	1		2,432	2,432	81,450	142,722		1.5	98.8	89.2
1	Alabama City, Gadsden & Attalla Ry. Co.....	1		1,500	1,500	81,450	144,222		.9	98.8	90.1
44	Municipal stations.....	34	682	6,847	7,529	82,132	151,751	.8	4.7	99.6	94.8
	All other stations.....	32	334	8,012	8,346	82,466	160,097	.4	5.2	100	100
	Total.....	81	82,466	77,631	160,097			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....		9,880	73,525	83,403						
ARIZONA.											
17	Ray Consolidated Copper Co.....	1		14,700	14,700		14,700		16.7		16.7
1	Arizona Copper Co.....	1		10,000	10,000		24,700		11.3		28
2	Arizona Power Co.....	2	9,000	750	9,750	9,000	34,450	26.8	11	26.8	39
6	Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Co.....	2		5,170	5,170	9,000	39,620		5.9	26.8	44.9
11	Federal Light & Traction Co.....	1		2,180	2,180	9,000	41,800		2.5	26.8	47.4
21, 30	United States railway stations and municipal stations.....	6	24,250	40	24,290	33,250	66,090	72.1	27.6	98.9	75
	All other stations.....	18	380	21,685	22,065	33,630	88,155	1.1	25	100	100
	Total.....	31	33,630	54,525	88,155			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....		817	10,198	11,015						
ARKANSAS.											
56	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut.....	1		9,900	9,900		9,900		18.5		18.5
17	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	1		5,425	5,425		15,325		10.2		28.7
47	Pine Bluff Co.....	1		5,250	5,250		20,575		9.8		38.5
1	Arkansas Light & Power Co.....	7	3,620	3,620	7,240		24,195		6.8		45.3
53	Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.....	1		3,350	3,350		27,545		6.3		51.6
43	Merchants Lighting Co.....	1		3,330	3,330		30,875		6.2		57.8
28	Federal Light & Traction Co.....	1		3,000	3,000		33,875		5.6		63.4
51	Seofield Engineering Co. of Philadelphia.....	1		1,670	1,670		35,545		3.1		66.5
41	Mammoth Springs Electric Light & Power Co.....	1	1,600		1,600	1,600	37,145	72.7	3	72.7	69.5
52	Seven Cities Co.....	1	600	500	1,100	2,200	38,245	27.3	2.1	100	71.6
27	Fayetteville Gas & Electric Co.....	1		1,020	1,020	2,200	39,265		1.9	100	73.5
60	Municipal stations.....	17		5,262	5,262	2,200	44,527		9.9	100	83.4
	All other stations.....	37		8,887	8,887	2,200	53,414		16.6	100	100
	Total.....	71	2,200	51,214	53,414			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....		3,040	39,564	42,604						

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
CALIFORNIA.											
79	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	13	152,080	108,540	260,620	152,080	260,620	21.1	20.5	20.1	20.5
93	Pacific Light & Power Corporation.	13	117,950	79,300	197,250	270,030	457,870	16.3	15.5	37.4	36
128	Southern California Edison Co.	11	56,400	79,120	135,520	326,430	593,390	7.8	10.7	45.2	46.7
165	Western Power Co.	4	73,330	38,670	112,000	399,790	705,390	10.2	8.8	55.4	55.5
155	United Railways Investment Co.	5	65,600	25,330	90,930	465,360	796,320	9.1	7.2	64.5	62
115	San Joaquin Light & Power Co.	8	40,150	28,950	69,100	505,510	865,420	5.6	5.4	70.1	68
58	Nevada-California Power Co.	7	37,750	10,670	48,420	543,260	913,840	5.2	3.8	75.3	72
66	Northern California Power Co.	7	47,200		47,200	590,460	961,040	6.6	3.7	81.9	78.5
9	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	6	17,200	20,020	37,220	607,660	998,260	2.4	2.9	84.3	81.2
92	Pacific Lighting Corporation.	1		34,202	34,202	607,660	1,032,462		2.7	84.3	83.8
149	United Properties Co.	6		33,025	33,025	607,660	1,065,487		2.6	84.3	85.7
198	Southern Pacific Co.	2		23,870	23,870	607,660	1,089,357		1.9	84.3	87.6
58	Mount Whitney Power Co.	5	14,650	9,000	23,650	622,310	1,113,007	2	1.9	86.3	88.2
67	Oro Electric Corporation.	3	6,000	1,300	7,300	628,310	1,120,307	.8	.6	87.1	88.6
16	California-Oregon Power Co.	2	5,300		5,300	633,610	1,125,607	.7	.4	87.8	93.1
173	Municipal stations.	18	45,700	12,000	57,700	679,310	1,183,307	6.3	4.5	94.1	100
	All other stations.	85	42,815	44,985	87,800	722,125	1,271,107	5.9	6.9	100	
	Total.	200	722,125	548,982	1,271,107			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		432,327	449,232	881,559						
COLORADO.											
14	Colorado Power Co.	7	41,750	4,870	46,620	41,750	46,620	45.2	24	45.2	24
26	Doherty Operating Co.	1		24,650	24,650	41,750	71,270		12.7	45.2	36.7
74	Utah Securities Corporation.	8	18,630	1,480	20,110	60,380	91,380	20.2	10.3	65.4	47
7	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	5	2,400	11,894	14,294	62,780	105,674	2.6	7.4	68	54.4
70	United Gas & Electric Co. of Connecticut.	2	4,750	6,460	11,210	67,530	116,884	5.1	5.8	73.1	60.2
33	Federal Light & Traction Co.	3		10,670	10,670	67,530	127,554		5.5	73.1	65.7
83	Western Light & Power Co.	1		10,670	10,670	67,530	138,224		5.5	73.1	71.2
65	Roaring Fork Electric Light & Power Co.	1	3,600		3,600	71,130	141,824	3.9	1.8	77	73
84	Municipal stations.	10	975	2,775	3,750	72,105	145,574	1.1	1.9	78.1	74.9
	All other stations.	103	20,198	28,569	48,767	92,303	194,341	21.9	25.1	100	100
	Total.	141	92,303	102,038	194,341			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		82,205	100,331	182,536						
CONNECTICUT.											
12, 64	New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R. Co.	13	8,050	35,275	43,325	8,050	43,325	19.2	22.5	19.2	22.5
52	United Illuminating Co.	2		31,200	31,200	8,050	74,525		16.2	19.2	38.7
13	The Hartford Electric Light Co.	3	3,600	20,670	24,270	11,650	98,795	8.6	12.6	27.8	51.3
42	Stone & Webster.	5	16,000	6,505	22,505	27,650	121,300	38.2	11.7	66	63
37	Shore Line Electric Ry. Co.	2		6,780	6,780	27,650	128,080		3.5	66	66.5
40	Stamford Gas & Electric Co.	1		6,080	6,080	27,650	134,160		3.2	66	69.7
31	Ponemah Mills.	1	2,500	3,304	5,804	30,150	139,964	5.9	3	71.9	72.7
19	Meriden Electric Light Co.	1		5,550	5,550	30,150	145,514		2.9	71.9	75.6
9	Derby Gas Co.	1	1,000	3,567	4,567	31,150	150,081	2.4	2.4	74.3	78
28	Ousatonic Water Power Co.	2	3,400		3,400	34,550	153,481	8.1	1.8	82.4	79.8
1	Atlantic Power & Light Corporation.	2	2,300	850	3,150	36,850	156,631	5.5	1.6	87.9	81.4
10	Doherty Operating Co.	1		2,733	2,733	36,850	159,364		1.4	87.9	82.8
71	Norwood & Westerly Traction Co.	1		2,470	2,470	36,850	161,834		1.3	87.9	84.1
50	The Uncas Power Co.	2	2,000		2,000	38,850	163,834	4.8	1	92.7	85.1
48	Torrington Electric Co.	1		2,000	2,000	38,850	165,834		1	92.7	86.1
32	Putnam Light & Power Co.	1	600	1,885	1,885	39,450	167,719	1.4	1	94.1	87.1
57	Municipal stations.	6		10,890	10,890	39,450	178,609		5.6	94.1	92.7
	All other stations.	27	2,460	11,575	14,035	41,910	192,644	5.9	7.3	100	100
	Total.	72	41,910	150,734	192,644			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		20,334	141,732	162,066						
DELAWARE.											
5	National Properties Co.	3		14,800	14,800		14,800		81.8		81.8
11	Municipal stations.	6		1,535	1,535		16,335		8.5		90.3
	All other stations.	7	54	1,750	1,804	54	18,139	100	9.7	100	100
	Total.	16	54	18,085	18,139			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		826	24,075	24,901						
FLORIDA.											
29	Stone & Webster.	4	1,400	8,615	10,015	1,400	10,015	19.9	21	19.9	21
11	Florida Power Co.	1	5,600		5,600	7,000	15,615	79.7	11.7	99.6	32.7
34	J. G. White & Co.	8		4,127	4,127	7,000	19,742		8.7	99.6	41.4
19	Miami Electric Light & Power Co.	1		2,255	2,255	7,000	21,997		4.7	99.6	46.1
13	General Utilities Operating Co.	1		2,000	2,000	7,000	23,997		4.2	99.6	50.3
21	Orlando Water & Light Co.	1		1,350	1,350	7,000	25,347		2.8	99.6	53.1
3	Bagdad Land & Lumber Co.	1		1,320	1,320	7,000	26,667		2.8	99.6	55.9
26	St. Johns Electric Co.	1		1,300	1,300	7,000	27,967		2.7	99.6	58.6
45	Municipal stations.	17		12,697	12,697	7,000	40,664		26.6	99.6	85.2
	All other stations.	27	30	7,033	7,063	7,030	47,727	.4	14.8	100	100
	Total.	62	7,030	40,697	47,727			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		7,100	44,604	51,704						
GEORGIA.											
19	Georgia Railway & Power Co.	7	100,400	33,720	134,120	100,400	134,120	46.1	39.7	46.1	39.7
47	Stone & Webster.	7	29,426	18,790	48,216	129,826	182,336	13.5	14.3	59.6	54
16	Georgia, Light, Power & Railways Co.	3	33,000	4,750	37,750	162,826	220,086	15.2	11.2	74.8	65.2
60	J. G. White & Co. Incorporated.	5	20,800	8,342	29,142	183,626	249,228	9.6	8.6	84.4	73.8
42	Savannah Lighting Co.	1		9,600	9,600	183,626	258,828		2.8	84.4	76.6
59	West Point Manufacturing Co.	1	3,000	5,000	8,000	186,626	266,828	1.4	2.4	85.8	79
8	Doherty Operating Co.	4	5,800	2,000	7,800	192,426	274,628	2.7	2.3	88.5	81.3
146	Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills.	1		6,500	6,500	192,426	281,128		1.9	88.5	83.2
1	Albany Power & Manufacturing Co.	1	2,300	2,130	4,460	194,756	285,588	1.1	1.3	89.6	84.5
55	Towalliga Falls Power Co.	1	3,600	750	4,350	198,356	289,938	1.6	1.3	91.2	85.5

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
GEORGIA—continued.											
144	Eagle & Phoenix Mills	1	4,000		4,000	202,356	293,938	1.8	1.2	93	87
41	Rome Railway Light & Power Co.	1	1,500	2,330	3,830	203,856	297,768	.7	1.1	93.7	88.1
65	Municipal stations	75	1,500	16,127	17,627	205,356	315,395	.7	5.2	94.4	93.3
	All other stations	49	12,199	10,012	22,211	217,555	337,606	5.6	6.7	100	100
	Total ¹	157	217,555	120,051	337,606			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		82,487	88,345	170,832						
IDAHO.											
49	Utah Securities Corporation	10	73,507	300	73,807	73,507	73,807	48.3	45.5	48.3	45.5
25	National Securities Corporation	9	31,350	2,000	33,350	107,857	110,157	22.5	22.4	70.8	67.9
59	Washington Water Power Co.	1	16,300		16,300	124,157	126,457	10.7	10	81.5	77.9
46	Thousand Springs Power Co.	1	3,000		3,000	127,157	129,457	2	1.8	83.5	79.7
14	Grangeville Electric Light & Power Co.	2	1,300		1,300	128,457	130,757	.8	.8	84.3	80.5
8	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	1		900	900	128,457	131,657		.6	84.3	81.1
47, 61	U. S. R. S. and municipal stations	5	14,350		14,350	142,837	146,007	9.4	8.8	93.7	89.9
	All other stations	43	9,553	6,800	16,353	152,360	162,360	6.3	10.1	100	100
	Total	72	152,360	10,000	162,360			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		51,850	4,525	56,375						
ILLINOIS.											
40	Commonwealth Edison Co.	4		511,150	511,150		511,150		55.6		55.6
191	Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois	13	5,300	55,930	61,230	5,300	572,380	9.8	6.7	9.8	62.3
231	United Light & Railways Co.	1		42,000	42,000	5,300	614,380		4.6	9.8	66.9
336, 64	Illinois Traction	28	4,115	35,886	40,001	9,415	654,381	7.6	4.4	17.4	71.3
105	Middle West Utilities Co.	66	4,630	29,180	33,810	14,045	688,191	8.5	3.7	25.9	75
33	Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.	7		26,480	26,480	14,045	714,671		2.9	25.9	77.9
332	Chicago surface lines	2		24,000	24,000	14,045	738,671		2.6	25.9	80.5
9	Aurora, Elgin & Chicago R. R. Co.	2	75	21,430	21,505	14,120	760,176	.1	2.3	26	82.8
3	American Gas Co.	2	1,680	16,700	18,380	15,800	778,556	3.1	2	29.1	84.8
27	E. W. Clark & Co. Mortgage Corporation	4		19,100	19,100	15,800	797,656		2.1	29.1	86.9
20	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	1		9,660	9,660	15,800	807,316		1	29.1	87.9
205	Rock Island Southern Ry. Co.	2		5,200	5,200	15,800	812,516		.6	29.1	88.5
211	Southern Illinois Light & Power Co.	7		4,546	4,546	15,800	817,062		.5	29.1	89
248	Municipal stations ²	86	31,500	20,906	55,406	50,300	873,458	63.4	6	92.5	95
	All other stations	119	4,101	41,156	46,257	54,401	918,725	7.5	5	100	100
	Total	344	54,401	864,324	918,725			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		42,562	777,849	820,411						
INDIANA.											
65	Indianapolis Light & Heat Co.	1		40,900	40,900		40,900		12.5		12.5
48	Fort Wayne & Northern Indiana Traction Co.	3		32,160	32,160		73,060		9.9		22.4
7	American Public Utilities Co.	2		24,200	24,200		97,260		7.4		29.8
92	Middle West Utilities Co.	21	4,400	19,430	23,830	4,400	121,090	54.4	7.3	54.4	37.1
139	Terre Haute, Indianapolis & Eastern Traction Co.	8		22,800	22,800	4,400	143,890		7	54.4	44.1
148	Union Traction Co. of Indiana	4		17,930	17,930	4,400	161,820		5.5	54.4	49.6
3	American Gas & Electric Co.	4		16,890	16,890	4,400	178,710		5.2	54.4	54.8
155	The United Gas Improvement Co.	1		15,566	15,566	4,400	194,276		4.8	54.4	59.6
63	Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.	2	1,300	13,330	14,630	5,700	208,906	16.1	4.5	70.5	64.1
32	Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.	1		13,070	13,070	5,700	221,976		4	70.5	68.1
28	Chicago, Lake Shore & South Bend Railway Co.	1		10,000	10,000	5,700	231,976		3.1	70.5	71.2
66	Indiana Railway & Light Co.	1		9,750	9,750	5,700	241,726		3	70.5	74.2
245	Indianapolis & Cincinnati Traction Co.	1		2,670	2,670	5,700	244,396		.8	70.5	75
169	Municipal stations	70	200	29,265	29,465	5,900	273,861	2.5	9	73	84
	All other stations	126	2,191	49,820	52,011	8,091	325,872	27	16	100	100
	Total	246	8,091	317,781	325,872			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		23,915	283,508	307,423						
IOWA.											
169	Stone & Webster	3	150,000		150,000	150,000	150,000	94.1	47.4	94.1	47.4
93	Iowa Railway & Light Co.	12		23,255	23,255	150,000	173,255		7.4	94.1	54.8
77	Illinois Traction Co.	6	300	15,649	15,949	150,300	189,204	.2	5.1	94.3	59.9
27	Central Iowa Light & Power Co.	3		10,400	10,400	150,300	199,604		3.3	94.3	63.2
180	Union Electric Co. of Dubuque	1		9,500	9,500	150,300	209,104		3	94.3	66.2
183	United Light & Railways Co.	6	500	8,025	8,525	150,800	217,629	.3	2.7	94.6	68.9
194	Waterloo, Cedar Falls & Northern Railway Co.	1		7,000	7,000	150,800	224,629		2.2	94.6	71.1
3	The American Gas Co.	5	345	6,545	6,890	151,145	231,519	.2	2.2	94.8	73.3
266	Des Moines City Railway Co.	1		6,750	6,750	151,145	238,269		2.1	94.8	75.4
164	Sioux City Service Co.	1		6,400	6,400	151,145	244,669		2	94.8	77.4
83	Interstate Power Co.	6	2,000	1,625	3,625	153,145	248,294	1.3	1.1	96.1	78.5
38	Continental Gas & Electric Corporation	7		3,363	3,363	153,145	251,657		1.1	96.1	79.6
19	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	1		3,350	3,350	153,145	255,007		1.1	96.1	80.7
196	Municipal stations	70	710	16,112	16,822	153,855	271,829	4	5.3	96.5	86
	All other stations	145	5,576	38,821	44,397	159,431	316,226	3.5	14	100	100
	Total	268	159,431	156,795	316,226			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		7,029	126,564	133,593						
KANSAS.											
27	Doherty Operating Co.	4	7,000	13,570	20,570	7,000	35,430		13.5	59.9	32.2
3	American Power & Light Co.	5		14,860	14,860	7,000	20,570	59.9	18.7	59.9	18.7
50	Illinois Traction Co.	2		7,491	7,491	7,000	42,921		6.8	59.9	39
14	Bowersack Mill & Power Co.	1	1,500	1,000	2,500	8,500	45,421	12.8	2.3	72.7	41.3
67	Light & Development Co. of St. Louis	1		2,030	2,030	8,500	47,451		1.9	72.7	43.2
103	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut	1		1,925	1,925	8,500	49,376		1.8	72.7	45

¹ Totals contain 12,649 water horsepower and 7,150 steam horsepower, total of 19,799 horsepower used in manufactures.

² Includes stations of Sanitary Drainage District of Chicago and of United States Army.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
KANSAS—continued.											
65	Land & Power Co.	1	1,015	840	1,855	9,515	51,231	8.7	1.7	81.4	46.7
109	Municipal stations	90	125	26,232	26,357	9,640	77,588	1.1	24	82.5	70.7
	All other stations	102	2,048	30,158	32,206	11,688	109,794	17.5	29.3	100	100
	Total	207	11,688	98,106	109,794			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		8,820	101,788	110,608						
KENTUCKY.											
105	Louisville Traction Co.	2		44,130	44,130	None.	44,130	None.	34.5	None.	34.5
6	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	1		33,330	33,330	None.	77,460	None.	26.1	None.	60.6
13	Columbia Gas & Electric Co. of West Virginia	1		9,100	9,100	None.	86,560	None.	7.1	None.	67.7
42	Kentucky Securities Corporation	1		6,670	6,670	None.	93,230	None.	5.2	None.	72.9
39	J. G. White & Co.	3		3,260	3,260	None.	96,490	None.	2.6	None.	75.5
54	Middle West Utilities Co.	7		3,195	3,195	None.	99,685	None.	2.5	None.	78
104	Kentucky Southwestern Electric Railway, Light & Power Co.	1		2,500	2,500	None.	102,185	None.	2	None.	80
78	Stone & Webster	1		2,350	2,350	None.	104,535	None.	1.8	None.	81
16	Consolidated Coal Co.	1		1,500	1,500	None.	106,035	None.	1.2	None.	83
52	Mayfield Water & Light Co.	1		1,200	1,200	None.	107,235	None.	.9	None.	83.9
47	Light & Development Co. of St. Louis	2		1,055	1,055	None.	108,290	None.	.8	None.	84.7
85	Municipal stations	18		7,730	7,730	None.	116,020	None.	6	None.	90.7
	All other stations	68		11,865	11,865	None.	127,885	None.	9.3	None.	100
	Total	107		127,885	127,885				100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912			108,227	108,227						
LOUISIANA.											
26	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut	4		66,665	66,665		66,665		73.4		73.4
23	Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.	1		3,450	3,450		70,115		3.8		77.2
58	Shreveport Railways Co.	1		2,450	2,450		72,565		2.7		79.9
12	Lake Charles Railway, Light & Water Works Co.	1		2,370	2,370		74,935		2.6		82.5
25	Stone & Webster	1		1,400	1,400		76,335		1.5		84
1	Algiers Railway & Lighting Co.	1		1,000	1,000		77,335		1.1		85.1
33	Municipal stations	25		8,061	8,061		85,395		8.9		94
	All other stations	26	160	5,284	5,444	160	90,840	100	6	100	100
	Total	60	160	90,680	90,840			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912			70,910	70,910						
MAINE.											
25	E. W. Clark & Co. Mgt. Corporation	16	37,330	18,390	55,720	37,330	55,720	13.4	16.4	13.4	16.4
119	International Paper Co.	7	45,750	8,995	53,845	83,080	109,565	16.5	15.9	29.9	32.3
18	Central Maine Power Co.	6	20,700	6,700	27,400	103,780	136,965	7.5	8.1	37.4	40.4
132	St. Croix Paper Co.	2	25,000		25,000	128,780	161,965	9	7.4	46.4	47.8
115	Great Northern Paper Co.	1	24,500		24,500	153,280	186,465	8.8	7.2	55.2	55
134	Union Water Power Co.	1	18,400		18,400	171,680	204,865	6.6	5.4	61.8	60.4
130	Pepperell Manufacturing Co.	1	7,000	10,800	17,800	178,680	222,665	2.5	5.2	64.3	65.6
136	S. D. Warren & Co.	6	12,200	5,000	17,200	190,880	239,865	4.4	5.1	68.7	70.7
126	Pejepscot Paper Co.	4	14,700	1,800	16,500	205,580	256,365	5.3	4.9	74	75.6
3	Hollingsworth & Whitney Co.	3	15,700		15,700	221,280	272,065	5.7	4.6	79.7	80.2
94	Rumford Falls Power Co.	1	15,000		15,000	236,280	287,065	5.4	4.4	85.1	84.6
63	Maine Railway, Light & Power Co.	5	2,686	2,600	5,286	238,966	232,351	1	1.6	86.1	86.2
110	Androscoggin Pulp Co.	2	3,522	1,100	4,622	242,488	296,973	1.3	1.4	87.4	87.6
112	Atlantic Shore Ry. Co.	3	3,100	1,100	4,200	245,588	301,173	1.1	1.2	88.5	88.8
113	Edwards Manufacturing Co.	1	4,000		4,000	249,588	305,173	1.4	1.2	89.9	90
13	Cabot Manufacturing Co.	1	3,300		3,300	252,888	308,473	1.2	1	91.1	91
105	Municipal stations	5	1,996	805	2,801	254,884	311,274	.7	.8	91.8	91.8
	All other stations	77	22,705	5,036	27,741	277,589	339,015	8.2	8.2	100	100
	Total	142	127,589	61,426	189,015			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		95,502	34,271	129,773						
MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.											
41	United Railways & Electric Co. of Baltimore	4		61,875	61,875		61,875		28.1		28.1
8	Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore	7	1,000	56,710	57,710	1,000	119,585	30.4	26.2	30.4	54.3
D. C.-2	Washington Railway & Electric Co.	1		53,800	53,800	1,000	173,385		24.5	30.4	78.8
D. C.-1	Capital Traction Co.	1		16,870	16,870	1,000	190,255		7.7	30.4	86.5
25	Hagerstown & Frederick Electric Ry. Co.	2		5,905	5,905	1,000	196,160		2.7	30.4	89.2
D. C.-4	Washington-Virginia Ry. Co.	1		4,170	4,170	1,000	200,330		1.9	30.4	91.1
53	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.	1		3,350	3,350	1,000	203,680		1.5	30.4	92.6
20	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Cumberland	1		3,273	3,273	1,000	206,953		1.5	30.4	94.1
54	Doherty Operating Co.	2		1,750	1,750	1,000	208,703		.8	30.4	94.9
46	Municipal stations	7		2,533	2,533	1,000	211,236		1.1	30.4	96
	All other stations	33	2,289	6,522	8,811	3,289	220,047	69.6	4	100	100
	Total	60	3,289	216,758	220,047			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		3,223	199,645	202,868						
MASSACHUSETTS.											
20	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.	3		140,850	140,850		140,850		17.5		17.5
170	Boston Elevated Ry. Co.	6		126,300	126,300		267,150		15.7		33.2
195	Massachusetts electric companies	13		57,575	57,575		324,725		7.2		40.4
63	New England Investment Co.	7		53,830	53,830		378,555		6.7		47.1
70	New England Power Co. of Maine	4	49,400		49,400	49,400	427,955	32.2	6.1	32.2	53.2
107	Turners Falls Power & Electric Co.	2	36,900		36,900	86,300	464,855	24.0	4.6	56.2	57.8
100	C. H. Tenney & Co.	2	681	29,688	30,369	86,981	495,224	.4	3.8	56.6	61.6
115	Worcester Electric Light Co.	2		21,330	21,330	86,981	516,554		2.7	56.6	64.3
92	Stone & Webster	3		20,630	20,630	86,981	537,184		2.6	56.6	66.9
110	United Electric Light Co.	3	4,500	15,000	19,500	91,481	556,684	2.9	2.4	59.5	62.3
37	Ludlow Manufacturing Association	3	9,900	8,200	18,100	101,381	574,784	6.5	2.2	66.0	71.3

¹ Totals include 170,272 water horsepower and 26,595 steam horsepower, total 196,867 horsepower, used in manufactures.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
MASSACHUSETTS—continued.											
23	Fall River Electric Co.	1		17,330	17,330	101,381	592,114		2.2	66.0	73.7
212	New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R. Co.	2		15,225	15,225	101,381	607,339		1.9	66.0	75.6
61	New Bedford Gas & Electric Co.	1		13,330	13,330	101,381	620,669		1.7	66.0	77.3
219	Proprietors of locks and canals.	1	11,262		11,262	112,643	631,931	7.3	1.4	73.3	78.7
167	Bliss Fabyan Co.	3	5,194	5,850	11,044	117,837	642,975	3.4	1.4	76.7	80.1
76	C. D. Parker & Co. (Inc.)	8	1,650	8,735	10,385	119,487	653,360	1.1	1.3	77.8	81.4
11	Cambridge Electric Light Co.	1		8,670	8,670	119,487	662,030		1.1	77.8	82.5
45	Massachusetts lighting companies.	11		8,485	8,485	119,487	670,515		1	77.8	83.5
117	Municipal stations.	33	1,270	32,553	33,823	120,757	704,338	.8	4.2	78.6	87.7
	All other stations.	108	32,928	65,725	98,653	153,685	802,991	21.4	12.3	100	100
	Total.	226	153,685	164,906	1802,991			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		26,189	597,387	623,576						
MICHIGAN.											
132	The North American Co.	12	5,133	176,572	181,705	5,133	181,705	2.4	30.2	2.4	30.2
33	Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.	38	70,813	66,610	137,423	75,946	319,128	33.2	22.8	35.6	53.0
290	Detroit United Railways.	9		46,986	46,986	75,946	366,114		7.8	35.6	60.8
174	Union Carbide Co.	1	30,800		30,800	106,746	396,914	14.4	5.1	50.0	65.9
103	Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.	2	9,400		9,400	116,146	406,314	4.4	1.6	54.4	67.5
29	Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co.	3	8,000		8,000	124,146	414,314	3.8	1.3	58.2	68.8
301	Otsego Water Power Co.	1	3,000	5,000	8,000	127,146	422,314	1.4	1.3	59.6	70.1
287	Cambria Steel Co.	2	5,000	2,000	7,000	132,146	429,314	2.4	1.2	62.0	71.3
118	Menominee & Marinette Light & Traction Co.	2	5,700	1,100	6,800	137,846	436,114	2.7	1.1	64.7	72.4
120	Michigan Power Co.	2	2,000	4,670	6,670	139,846	442,784	.9	1.1	65.6	73.5
150	Peninsular Power Co.	2	5,250	833	6,083	145,096	448,867	2.5	1.0	68.1	74.5
165	Stone & Webster.	2		5,750	5,750	145,096	454,617		.9	68.1	75.4
79	Escanaba Traction Co.	3	4,520	700	5,220	149,616	459,837	2.1	.9	70.2	76.3
303	Victoria Copper Mining Co.	1	4,000		4,000	153,616	463,837	1.9	.7	72.1	77.0
144	Oak Park Power Co.	1		4,000	4,000	153,616	467,837		.7	72.1	77.7
108	Ironwood & Bessemer Railway & Light Co.	1	2,600	1,300	3,900	156,216	471,737	1.2	.6	73.3	78.3
289	Carnegie Steel Co.	1	3,850		3,850	160,066	475,587	1.8	.6	75.1	78.9
122	Middle West Utilities Co.	4	2,286	320	3,606	162,352	479,193	1.1	.6	76.2	79.5
183	Municipal stations.	104	10,972	42,179	53,151	173,324	532,344	5.1	8.8	81.3	88.3
	All other stations.	112	39,787	30,531	70,318	213,111	602,662	18.7	11.7	100.0	100.0
	Total.	303	213,111	239,551	262,662			100.0	100.0		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		134,454	311,008	445,462						
MINNESOTA.											
96	Twin City Rapid Transit Co.	3	25,000	66,700	91,700	25,000	91,700	9.8	22	9.8	22
68	Northwestern Power Co.	2	57,000	4,670	61,670	82,000	153,370	22.4	14.8	32.2	36.8
10	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	10	43,450	18,500	61,950	125,450	215,320	17.1	14.8	49.3	51.6
81	Pillsbury Flour Mills Co.	2	57,500		57,500	182,950	272,820	22.6	13.8	71.9	65.4
254	Minnesota & Ontario Power Co.	1	12,500	10,000	22,500	195,450	295,320	4.9	5.4	76.8	70.8
1	American Light & Traction Co.	1	7,800	9,000	16,800	203,250	312,120	3.1	4	79.9	74.8
258	Northwest Paper Co.	3	8,527		8,527	211,777	320,647	3.3	2	83.2	76.8
32	Crookston Water Works, Power & Light Co.	1	4,000	1,600	5,600	215,777	326,247	1.6	1.3	84.8	78.1
242	Itasca Paper Co.	1	3,500	950	4,450	219,277	330,697	1.4	1.1	86.2	79.2
33	Cuyuna Range Power Co.	3	3,200	1,150	4,350	222,477	335,047	1.3	1	87.5	80.2
74	Otter Tail Power Co.	6	3,080	1,015	4,095	225,557	339,142	1.2	1	88.7	81.2
87	Public Service Co. of St. Cloud.	1	3,000	1,000	4,000	228,557	343,142	1.2	1	89.9	82.2
105	Municipal stations.	115	1,399	22,199	23,598	229,956	366,740	.5	5.7	90.4	87.9
	All other stations.	139	24,302	26,439	50,741	254,258	417,481	9.6	12.1	100	100
	Total.	288	254,258	262,223	417,481			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		102,172	159,522	261,694						
MISSISSIPPI.											
14	Gulfport & Mississippi Coast Traction Co.	1	None.	6,000	6,000	None.	6,000	None.	14.1	None.	14.1
11	Doherty Operating Co.	2	None.	5,295	5,295	None.	11,295	None.	12.5	None.	26.6
2	American Public Utilities Co.	1	None.	4,000	4,000	None.	15,295	None.	9.4	None.	36
17	Laurel Light & Railway Co.	1	None.	2,120	2,120	None.	17,415	None.	5	None.	41
10	Delta Light & Traction Co.	1	None.	1,730	1,730	None.	19,145	None.	4.1	None.	45.1
33	Vicksburg Light & Traction Co.	1	None.	1,650	1,650	None.	20,795	None.	3.9	None.	49
20	McComb City Electric Light & Traction Co.	1	None.	1,400	1,400	None.	22,195	None.	3.3	None.	52.3
32	United Public Utilities Co.	1	None.	1,100	1,100	None.	23,295	None.	2.6	None.	54.9
7	Columbia Railway, Light & Power Co.	1	None.	1,000	1,000	None.	24,295	None.	2.3	None.	57.2
5	Capital Light & Power Co.	1	None.	800	800	None.	25,095	None.	1.9	None.	59.1
37	Municipal stations.	42	None.	10,623	10,623	None.	35,718	None.	25	None.	84.1
	All other stations.	25	None.	6,785	6,785	None.	42,503	None.	15.9	None.	100
	Total.	78	None.	42,503	42,503	None.		None.	100	None.	
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		None.	40,347	40,347	None.		None.		None.	
MISSOURI.											
103, 203	North American Co.	9		131,450	131,450		131,450		40.2		40.2
26	Doherty Operating Co.	6	20,400	49,838	70,238	20,400	201,688	98.7	21.5	98.7	61.7
54	Kansas City Ry. & Light Co.	1		53,300	53,300	20,400	254,988		16.3	98.7	78
62	The Laclede Gas Light Co.	1		10,000	10,000	20,400	264,988		3.1	98.7	81.1
69	Light & Development Co. of St. Louis.	7		4,810	4,810	20,400	269,798		1.5	98.7	82.6
39	Federal Light & Traction Co.	1		4,040	4,040	20,400	273,838		1.2	98.7	83.8
208	Southern Missouri Ry. Co.	1		3,000	3,000	20,400	276,838		.9	98.7	84.7
89	Middle West Utilities Co.	7		2,805	2,805	20,400	279,643		.8	98.7	85.5
201	Joplin & Pittsburg Ry. Co.	1		2,550	2,550	20,400	282,193		.8	98.7	86.3
135	Municipal stations.	65		19,501	19,501	20,400	301,694		6	98.7	92.3
	All other stations.	109		25,106	25,106	20,670	327,070		1.3	7.7	100
	Total.	208	20,670	306,400	327,070			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		1,902	306,133	308,035						

¹ Totals include 32,348 water horsepower and 9,597 steam horsepower; total, 41,945 horsepower used in manufactures.

² Totals include 15,850 water horsepower and 7,000 steam horsepower; total, 22,850 horsepower used in manufactures.

³ Totals include 39,384 water horsepower and 14,867 steam horsepower; total, 54,251 horsepower, used in manufactures.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
MONTANA.											
23	Montana Power Co.	19	179,700	8,300	188,000	179,700	188,000	88.6	79.8	88.6	79.8
1, 57	Amalgamated Copper Co.	3	11,830	9,000	20,830	191,530	208,830	5.8	8.9	94.4	88.7
8	Clark-Missoula Power Co.	1	3,200	1,067	4,267	194,730	213,097	1.6	1.8	96	90.5
5	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	2	2,820	250	3,070	197,550	216,167	1.4	1.3	97.4	91.8
55	Municipal stations.	2		1,005	1,005	197,550	217,172		.4	97.4	92.2
	All other stations.	38	5,345	13,071	18,416	202,895	235,588	2.6	7.8	100	100
	Total.	65	202,895	32,693	235,588			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		103,686	13,575	117,260						
NEBRASKA.											
86	Omaha Electric Light & Power Co.	1		24,000	24,000		24,000		24.3		24.3
196	Omaha & Council Bluffs Street Ry. Co.	1		23,375	23,375		47,375		23.7		48
75	Lincoln Traction Co.	1		5,100	5,100		52,475		5.2		53.2
35	Doherty Operating Co.	2		2,700	2,700		55,175		2.7		55.9
70	Kearney Water & Electric Power Co.	1	1,350	1,350	2,700	1,350	57,875	12.5	2.7	12.5	58.6
21	Continental Gas & Electric Corporation.	6		2,595	2,595	1,350	60,470		2.6	12.5	61.2
111	Union Co. of Omaha	1		1,450	1,450	1,350	61,920		1.5	12.5	62.7
11	Blue River Power Co.	1	700	600	1,300	2,050	63,220	6.5	1.3	19	64
49	Grand Island Electric Co.	1		1,033	1,033	2,050	64,253		1.1	19	65.1
48	Gothenburg Light & Power Co.	1	500	400	900	2,550	65,153	4.6	0.9	23.6	66
121	Municipal stations.	73	5,050	14,414	19,464	7,600	84,617	46.8	19.7	70.4	85.7
	All other stations.	107	3,199	10,902	14,101	10,799	98,718	29.6	14.3	100	100
	Total.	196	10,799	87,919	98,718			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways		5,884	65,409	71,293						
NEVADA.											
10	Stone & Webster.	3	9,800		9,800	9,800	9,800	73.6	37.1	73.6	37.1
19	Utah Copper Co.	1		9,775	9,775	9,800	19,575		37	73.6	74.1
14	United States Reclamation Service.	1	2,490		2,490	12,290	22,065	18.7	9.4	92.3	83.5
5	Ely Light & Power Co.	2	160	1,400	1,560	12,450	23,625	1.2	5.9	93.5	89.4
4	Elko Lamolle Power Co.	2	415	300	715	12,865	24,340	3.1	2.7	96.6	92.1
17	Municipal stations.	9				12,865	24,340			96.6	92.1
	All other stations.	1	455	1,644	2,099	13,320	26,439	3.4	7.9	100	100
	Total.	19	13,320	13,119	26,439			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		12,540	2,880	15,420						
NEW HAMPSHIRE.											
70	Berlin Mills Co.	2	31,700		31,700	31,700	31,700	29.2	21.2	29.2	21.2
4	Amoskeag Manufacturing Co.	1	22,445		22,445	54,145	54,145	20.7	15	49.9	36.2
73	International Paper Co.	2	15,300	2,350	17,650	69,445	71,795	14.1	11.8	64	48
40	Manchester Traction, Light & Power Co.	2	5,900	6,000	11,900	75,345	83,695	5.4	8	69.4	56
49	New Hampshire Electric Rys. Co.	1		10,670	10,670	75,345	94,365		7.1	69.4	63.1
76	Pacific Mills.	2	1,500	5,060	6,560	76,845	100,925	1.4	4.4	70.8	67.5
27	J. E. Henry & Sons Co.	1	1,800	2,800	4,600	78,645	105,525	1.7	3.1	72.5	70.6
75	Nashua Manufacturing Co.	1	4,500		4,500	83,145	110,025	4.1	3	76.6	73.6
45	Middle West Utilities Co.	2	1,600	2,000	3,600	84,745	113,625	1.5	2.4	78.1	76
9	Boston & Maine R. R. Co.	3	2,190	1,050	3,240	86,935	116,865	2	2.2	80.1	78.2
15	Concord Electric Co.	1	2,000	1,000	3,000	88,935	119,865	1.8	2	81.9	80.2
72	Great Falls Manufacturing Co.	1	3,000		3,000	91,935	122,865	2.8	2	84.7	82.2
78	Suncook Mills.	1	3,000		3,000	94,935	125,865	2.8	2	87.5	84.2
6	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Incorporated).	1	600	1,900	2,500	95,535	128,365	.6	1.7	88.1	85.9
68	Municipal stations.	2	600	545	1,145	96,135	129,510	.6	.8	88.7	86.7
	All other stations.	55	12,280	7,645	19,925	108,415	149,435	11.3	13.3	100	100
	Total.	78	108,415	141,020	149,435			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		59,119	29,211	88,330						
NEW JERSEY.											
47	Public Service Corporation of New Jersey.	16		232,905	232,905		232,905		68.6		68.6
1	American Gas & Electric Co.	2		17,675	17,675		250,580		5.2		73.8
44	Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	1		10,670	10,670		261,250		3.1		76.9
38	New Jersey General Security Co.	3	7,200		7,200	7,200	268,450	72.4	2.1	72.4	79
30	Jersey Central Traction Co.	1		6,400	6,400	7,200	274,850		1.9	72.4	80.9
9	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Incorporated).	4	1,500	3,630	5,130	8,700	279,980	15.1	1.5	87.5	82.4
2	American Light & Traction Co.	1		3,950	3,950	8,700	283,930		1.2	87.5	83.6
4	American Railways Co.	1		2,725	2,725	8,700	286,655		.8	87.5	84.4
20	Commonwealth Water & Light Co.	2	100	2,450	2,550	8,800	289,205	1	.7	88.5	85.1
66	Sayreville Electric Light & Power Co.	1		2,500	2,500	8,800	291,705		.7	88.5	85.8
82	Municipal stations.	10	112	2,885	2,997	8,912	294,702	1.1	.9	89.6	86.7
	All other stations.	60	1,035	43,845	44,880	9,947	339,582	10.4	13.3	100	100
	Total.	102	9,947	329,635	339,582			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		1,569	267,043	268,612						
NEW MEXICO.											
6	Federal Light & Traction Co.	3		5,158	5,158		5,158		37.1		37.1
18	Roswell Gas & Electric Co.	1		1,650	1,650		6,808		11.9		49
19	Santa Fe Water & Electric Co.	1	102	445	547	102	7,815	18.5	4	18.5	53
20	Silver City Power Co.	1		460	460	102	7,355		3.3	18.5	56.3
17	Raton Electric Light & Power Co.	1		425	425	102	8,240		3.1	18.5	59.4
16	Public Utilities Co.	1	350		350	452	8,590	63.4	2.5	81.9	61.9
14	Peoples Light & Power Co.	1		350	350	452	8,940		2.5	81.9	64.4
25	Tucumcari Light & Power Co.	1		350	350	452	9,290		2.5	81.9	66.9
26, 27	United States Reclamation Service and municipal stations.	4		3,185	3,185	452	12,475		22.9	81.9	89.8
	All other stations.	16	100	1,322	1,422	552	13,897	18.1	10.2	100	100
	Total.	30	552	13,345	13,897			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		817	10,198	11,015						

¹ Totals include 59,000 water horsepower and 7,410 steam horsepower, total 66,410 horsepower used in manufacturing.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
NEW YORK.											
28	Consolidated Gas Co. of New York	8		481,895	481,895		481,895		21.2		21.2
388	Interborough Metropolitan Co.	2		246,500	246,500		728,395		10.8		32
371	Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co.	5		198,025	198,025		926,420		8.7		40.7
66	Hydraulic Power Co. of Niagara Falls	3	153,000		153,000	153,000	1,079,420	19.1	6.7	19.1	47.4
102	The Niagara Falls Power Co.	2	115,000		115,000	268,000	1,194,420	14.4	5.1	33.5	52.5
97, 408	New York Central & Hudson River R. R. Co.	4	22,325	70,800	93,125	290,325	1,287,545	2.8	4.1	36.3	56.6
391	International Paper Co.	10	75,180	17,025	92,205	365,505	1,379,750	9.4	4.1	45.7	60.7
411	Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	1		74,700	74,700	365,505	1,454,450		3.3	45.7	64
72	Kings County Electric Light & Power Co.	3		74,670	74,670	365,505	1,529,120		3.3	45.7	67.3
145	Stone & Webster	4	45,800	9,000	54,800	411,305	1,583,920	5.7	2.4	51.4	69.7
5	Aluminum Co. of America	2	40,000		40,000	451,305	1,623,920	5	1.8	56.4	71.5
104	Niagara, Lockport & Ontario Power Co.	1	40,000		40,000	491,305	1,663,920	5	1.8	61.4	73.3
53	General Electric Co.	3	31,000		31,000	522,305	1,694,920	3.9	1.4	65.3	74.7
25	Cohoes Co.	1	30,000		30,000	552,305	1,724,920	3.7	1.3	69	76
387	Hudson & Manhattan R. R. Co.	1		24,000	24,000	552,305	1,748,920		1.1	69	77.1
164	Utica Gas & Electric Co.	5	11,800	11,000	22,800	564,105	1,771,720	1.5	1	70.5	78.1
418	St. Regis Paper Co.	5	19,800	2,590	22,390	583,905	1,794,110	2.5	1	73	79.1
158	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut.	2	500	18,440	18,940	584,405	1,813,050	.1	.8	73.1	79.9
432	West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.	1	9,550	8,800	18,350	593,955	1,831,400	1.2	.8	74.3	80.7
160	United Gas Improvement Co.	3	350	15,720	16,070	594,305	1,847,470		.7	74.3	81.4
319	Municipal stations.	48	3,155	10,721	13,876	597,460	1,861,246	.4	.6	74.7	82
	All other stations.	335	202,070	207,464	409,534	799,530	2,270,880	25.3	18	100	100
	Total	449	1,799,530	1,471,350	2,270,880			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		530,921	1,282,608	1,813,529						
NORTH CAROLINA.											
61	Southern Power Co.	4	30,000	38,010	68,010	30,000	68,010	30.3	37.6	30.3	37.
8	Carolina Power & Light Co.	9	44,400	7,725	52,125	74,400	120,135	44.8	28.9	75.1	66.6
46	North Carolina Electrical Power Co.	3	7,530		7,530	81,930	127,665	7.6	4.2	82.7	70.5
66	Southern Public Utilities Co.	2	2,100	3,350	5,450	84,030	133,115	2.1	3.0	84.8	73.7
71	Tidewater Power Co.	1		5,000	5,000	84,030	138,115		2.8	84.8	76.7
53	J. A. Roper Lumber Co.	3		4,300	4,300	84,030	142,415		2.4	84.8	78.5
131	Roanoke Rapids Power Co.	1	4,100		4,100	88,130	146,515	4.1	2.3	88.9	81.9
127	Erwin Cotton Mills Co.	1	2,037	1,240	3,277	90,167	149,792	2.1	1.8	91.0	83.2
51	Piedmont Railway & Electric Co.	1		2,500	2,500	90,167	152,292		1.4	91.0	84.0
49	North Carolina Public Service Co.	2		2,480	2,480	90,167	154,772		1.4	91.0	85.4
24	Doherty Operating Co.	1		2,200	2,200	90,167	156,972		1.2	91.0	87.8
35	Haywood Electric Power Co.	1	1,950		1,950	92,117	158,922	2.0	1.1	93.0	88.0
69	Spencer Mountain Mills	1	1,000		1,000	93,117	159,922	1.0	.5	94.0	88.1
28	Electric Light Co. of Elizabeth City	1		1,000	1,000	93,117	160,922		.5	94.0	89.6
77	Municipal stations.	49	1,035	8,923	9,958	94,152	170,880	1.0	5.5	95.0	94.1
	All other stations.	51	4,953	4,793	9,746	99,105	180,626	5.0	5.4	100.0	100.0
	Total	131	99,105	81,521	180,626			100.0	100.0		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		60,151	233,56	93,713						
NORTH DAKOTA.											
2	H. M. Bylesby & Co.	3		6,950	6,950		6,950		36.7		36.7
18	Hughes Electric Co.	1		1,200	1,200		8,150		6.3		43.0
32	Otter Tail Power Co.	2		600	600		8,750		3.2		46.2
37, 44	United States Reclamation Service and municipal stations.	12		4,212	4,212		12,962		22.3		68.5
	All other stations.	62	80	5,883	5,963	80	18,925	100.0	31.5	100.0	100.0
	Total	80	80	18,845	18,925			100.0	100.0		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.			16,249	16,249						
OHIO.											
47	Central States Electric Corporation.	1		135,700	135,700		135,700		18.1		18.1
387	Ohio Traction Co.	6		65,611	65,611		201,311		8.7		26.8
88	Doherty Operating Co.	11	1,700	63,735	65,435	1,700	266,746	8.5	8.7	8.5	35.5
62	Columbia Gas & Electric Co.	1		38,930	38,930	1,700	305,676		5.2	8.5	40.7
68	Columbus Railway, Power & Lighting Co.	6		34,670	34,670	1,700	340,346		4.6	8.5	45.3
182	Northern Ohio Traction & Lighting Co.	2	2,270	31,000	33,270	3,970	373,616	11.4	4.4	19.9	49.7
184	Ohio Electric Railway Co.	6	700	27,800	28,500	4,670	402,116	3.5	3.8	23.4	53.5
37	Cleveland Railway Co.	2		27,100	27,100	4,670	429,216		3.6	23.4	57.1
4	American Gas & Electric Co.	11		25,405	25,405	4,670	454,621		3.4	23.4	60.5
78	Dayton Power & Light Co.	6	100	20,120	20,220	4,770	474,841	.5	2.7	23.9	63.2
203	Republic Railway & Light Co.	2		16,330	16,330	4,770	491,171		2.2	23.9	65.4
58	Cleveland, Southwestern & Columbus Ry. Co.	3		14,750	14,750	4,770	505,921		2	23.9	67.4
103	East Liverpool Traction & Light Co.	3	330	14,100	14,430	5,100	520,351	1.6	1.9	25.5	69.3
238	United Service Co.	5	1,630	10,190	11,820	6,730	532,171	8.2	1.6	33.7	70.9
249	Western Ohio R. R. Co.	1		11,330	11,330	6,730	543,501		1.5	33.7	72.4
147	Lake Shore Electric Ry. Co.	1		11,000	11,000	6,730	554,501		1.5	33.7	73.9
64	Columbus, Delaware & Marion Ry. Co.	4		9,660	9,660	6,730	564,161		1.3	33.7	75.2
28	W. S. Barstow & Co.	3		6,890	6,890	6,730	571,051		.9	33.7	76.1
24	Anglaize Power Co.	1	6,666		6,666	13,396	577,717	33.4	.9	67.1	77
74	Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.	1		6,000	6,000	13,396	583,717		.8	67.1	77.8
260	Municipal stations.	114	175	55,759	55,934	13,571	639,651	.9	7.5	68	85.3
	All other stations.	205	6,377	103,709	110,086	19,948	749,737	32	14.7	100	100
	Total	395	19,948	729,789	749,737			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.		10,690	659,657	670,347						
OKLAHOMA.											
9	H. M. Bylesby & Co.	5		17,215	17,215		17,215		24.4		24.4
48	Middle West Utilities Co.	7	1,200	9,490	10,690	1,200	27,905	68.2	15.2	68.2	39.6
138	Oklahoma Railway Co.	1		5,980	5,980	1,200	33,885		8.5	68.2	48.1
3	American Public Service Co.	2		2,125	2,125	1,200	36,010		3	68.2	51

¹ Totals include 181,238 water horsepower and 34,026 steam horsepower; total, 215,264 horsepower used in manufactures.

² Totals include 6,887 water horsepower and 1,365 steam horsepower; total, 8,252 horsepower used in manufacturing.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
OKLAHOMA—continued.											
18	Choctaw Railway & Lighting Co.	1		1,650	1,650	1,200	37,660		2.3	68.2	53.4
64	Southwestern Cities Electric Co.	3		1,560	1,560	1,200	39,220		2.2	68.2	55.6
6	Ardmore Ice, Light & Power Co.	1		1,525	1,525	1,200	40,745		2.2	68.2	57.8
63	Shawnee Gas & Electric Co.	1		1,450	1,450	1,200	42,195		2.1	68.2	59.9
24	Doherty Operating Co.	1		1,420	1,420	1,200	43,615		2	68.2	61.9
75	Municipal stations	61	358	11,428	11,786	1,558	55,401	20.4	16.7	88.6	78.6
	All other stations	56	200	14,908	15,108	1,758	70,509	11.4	21.4	100	100
	Total	139	1,758	68,751	70,509			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		2,135	61,462	63,597						
OREGON.											
53	E. W. Clark & Co. Mortgage Corporation	11	80,000	35,875	115,875	80,000	115,875	51	52.3	51	52.3
94	Crown-Willamette Paper Co.	3	26,124	3,500	29,624	106,124	145,499	16.7	13.4	67.7	65.7
14	California-Oregon Power Co.	5	11,100		11,100	117,224	156,599	7.1	5	74.8	70.7
1	American Power & Light Co.	5	9,090	1,650	10,740	126,314	167,339	5.8	4.8	80.6	75.5
9	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	6	520	6,227	6,747	128,334	174,086	.3	3	80.9	78.5
49	National Securities Corporation	1	5,000		5,000	131,834	179,086	3.2	2.3	84.1	80.8
31	Eastern Oregon Light & Power Co.	5	3,700		3,700	135,534	182,786	2.3	1.7	86.4	82.5
81	Municipal stations	12	4,646	242	4,888	140,180	187,674	3	2.2	89.4	84.7
	All other stations	53	16,583	17,447	34,030	156,763	221,704	10.6	15.3	100	100
	Total	101	156,763	64,941	221,704			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		105,302	50,163	155,465						
PENNSYLVANIA.											
88	The Philadelphia Co.	10		161,508	161,508		161,508		16.2		16.2
85	Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.	2	118,000		118,000	118,000	279,508	70	11.9	70	28.1
305	Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co.	5		105,730	105,730		385,238		10.6	70	38.7
60	Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.	4	5,397	70,503	75,867	123,367	461,105	3.2	7.6	73.2	46.3
8	American Water Works & Electric Co.	11		49,545	49,545	123,367	510,650		5	73.2	51.3
19	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Inc.)	10	2,400	46,800	49,200	123,367	559,850	1.4	5	74.6	56.3
6	American Gas & Electric Co.	3		35,800	35,800	123,367	595,650		3.6	74.6	59.9
116	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut	1		22,950	22,950	123,367	618,600		2.3	74.6	62.2
134	York Haven Water & Power Co.	3	20,000		20,000	145,767	638,600	11.9	2	86.5	64.2
64	Lehigh Valley Transit Co.	6		18,330	18,330	145,767	656,930		1.8	86.5	66.5
75	Penn Central Light & Power Co.	3	2,000	16,220	18,220	147,767	675,150	1.2	1.8	87.7	67.8
126	H. D. Walbridge & Co.	2	250	14,250	14,500	148,017	689,650	.2	1.5	87.9	69.3
98	Philadelphia Electric Co.	2		13,920	13,920	148,017	703,570		1.4	87.9	70.7
49	Erie County Electric Co.	1		11,770	11,770	148,017	715,340		1.2	87.9	71.9
1	American Gas Co.	5	500	10,800	11,300	148,517	726,640	.3	1.1	88.2	73
259	Municipal stations	41	538	15,549	16,087	149,055	742,727	.3	1.6	88.5	74.6
	All other stations	243	19,478	232,856	252,334	168,533	995,061	11.5	25.4	100	100
	Total	350	168,533	826,528	995,061			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		133,018	775,861	908,879						
RHODE ISLAND.											
6	New York, New Haven & Hudson River Ry. Co.	1		46,000	46,000		46,000		48.5		48.5
3	Narragansett Electric Lighting Co.	3		28,260	28,260		74,260		29.8		78.3
1	Massachusetts Lighting Cos.	2		9,800	9,800		84,060		10.4		88.7
7	Stone & Webster	3	2,485	6,650	9,135	2,485	93,195	100	9.6	100	98.3
12	Municipal stations	1				2,485	93,195	100		100	98.3
	All other stations	2		1,625	1,625	2,485	94,820		1.7	100	100
	Total	12	2,485	92,335	94,820			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		2,440	92,909	95,349						
SOUTH CAROLINA.											
34	Southern Power Co.	5	127,850	9,000	136,850	127,850	136,850	56.3	50	56.3	50
12	Columbia Ry., Gas & Electric Co.	2	26,000	7,330	33,330	153,850	170,180	11.5	12.2	67.8	62.2
39	Southern Public Utilities Co.	5	16,300	1,850	18,150	170,150	188,330	7.2	6.6	75.0	68.8
32	South Carolina Light, Power & Railways Co.	2	12,000	4,000	16,000	182,150	204,330	5.3	5.9	80.3	74.7
74	Pelzer Manufacturing Co.	1	6,500	4,500	11,000	188,650	215,330	2.9	4	83.2	78.7
45	Union Manufacturing & Power Co.	1	8,000		8,000	196,650	223,330	3.5	2.9	86.7	81.6
46	United Gas Improvement Co.	1		6,670	6,670	196,650	230,000		2.4	86.7	84
48	Ware Shoals Manufacturing Co.	1	5,000		5,000	201,650	235,000	2.2	1.8	88.9	85.8
75	Tucapau Mills	1	5,000		5,000	206,650	240,000	2.2	1.8	91.1	97.6
1	Belton Power Co.	1	4,650		4,650	211,300	244,650	2	1.7	93.1	89.3
72	Lockhart Mills	1	2,800		2,800	214,100	247,450	1.2	1	94.3	90.3
73	Pacolet Manufacturing Co.	1	2,800		2,800	216,900	250,250	1.2	1	95.5	91.3
70	Clifton Manufacturing Co.	1	2,000	750	2,750	218,900	253,000	.9	1	96.4	92.3
49	Municipal stations	21		4,625	4,625	218,900	257,625		1.7	96.4	94
	All other stations	22	8,112	8,300	16,412	227,012	274,037	3.6	6	100	100
	Total	76	127,012	147,025	274,037			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		178,555	52,051	230,606						
SOUTH DAKOTA.											
40	Homestake Mining Co.	2	6,225	175	6,400	6,225	6,400	47.8	13.5	47.8	13.5
8	H. M. Byllesby & Co.	3	2,065	3,740	5,805	8,290	12,205	15.8	12.2	63.6	26.7
17	Consolidated Power & Light Co. of South Dakota	2	1,000	4,670	5,670	9,290	17,875	7.7	11.9	71.3	37.6
20	Dakota Power Co.	2	2,550	530	3,080	11,840	20,955	19.6	6.5	90.9	44.1
78	Municipal stations	17		2,356	2,356	11,840	23,311		5	90.9	49.1
	All other stations	70	1,213	22,963	24,176	13,053	47,487	9.1	50.9	100	100
	Total	96	13,053	34,434	47,487			100	100		
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912		6,913	20,835	27,748						

¹ Totals include 20,400 water horsepower, and 5,950 steam horsepower, total, 26,350 horsepower, used in manufactures.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of station.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
TENNESSEE.											
10	E. W. Clark & Co. Mortgage Corporation.....	5	45,000	30,000	75,000	45,000	75,000	46	40.1	46	40.1
9	Chattanooga & Tennessee River Power Co.....	1	42,000	42,000	87,000	117,000	42.9	22.4	88.9	62.5
58, 90	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut.....	2	22,970	22,970	87,000	139,970	12.3	88.9	74.8
40	Memphis Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.....	1	11,500	11,500	87,000	151,470	6.1	88.9	80.9
41	Merchants Power Co.....	1	7,330	7,330	87,000	158,800	3.9	88.9	84.8
56	Tennessee Eastern Electric Co.....	2	5,000	2,270	7,270	92,000	166,070	5.1	3.9	94	88.8
22	Doherty Operating Co.....	2	3,200	800	4,000	95,200	170,070	3.3	2.1	97.3	90.8
47	Public Light & Power Co.....	4	980	1,250	2,230	96,180	172,300	1	1.2	98.3	92
31	Jackson Railway & Light Co.....	1	1,670	1,670	96,180	173,9709	98.3	92.9
61	Municipal stations.....	29	300	6,646	6,946	96,480	180,916	.3	3.7	98.6	96.6
	All other stations.....	42	1,355	5,014	6,369	97,835	187,285	1.4	3.4	100	100
	Total.....	90	97,835	89,450	187,285	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	27,750	94,611	122,361
TEXAS.											
208	Stone & Webster.....	11	71,793	71,793	71,793	32.1	32.1
5	American Power & Light Co.....	19	46,775	46,775	118,568	20.9	53
232	United Gas & Electric Corporation.....	1	15,500	15,500	134,068	6.9	59.9
4	American Light & Traction Co.....	1	12,278	12,278	146,346	5.5	65.4
73	Doherty Operating Co.....	5	6,290	6,290	152,636	2.8	68.2
24	American Public Service Co.....	7	4,220	4,220	156,856	1.9	70.1
222	Texas Southern Electric Co.....	5	1,800	1,552	3,352	1,800	160,208	26.6	1.5	26.6	71.6
247	Yellow Pine Paper Mills Co.....	1	3,000	3,000	1,800	163,208	1.3	26.6	72.9
70	Dallas Ice Factory, Light & Power Co.....	1	2,350	2,350	1,800	165,558	1.1	26.6	74
138	The Laredo Electric Ry. Co.....	1	1,900	1,900	1,800	167,4589	26.6	74.9
268	Austin Street Ry. Co.....	1	1,750	1,750	1,800	169,2088	26.6	75.7
61	Colorado River Power Co.....	1	1,650	1,650	3,450	170,858	24.3	.7	50.9	76.4
57	Citizens Electric Light & Power Co.....	1	1,190	250	1,440	4,640	172,298	17.6	.6	68.5	77
1, 248	State and municipal stations.....	21	225	8,249	8,474	4,865	180,772	3.3	3.8	71.8	80.8
	All other stations.....	198	1,912	40,949	42,861	6,777	223,633	28.2	19.2	100	100
	Total.....	274	6,777	216,856	223,633	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	3,503	164,185	167,688
UTAH.											
22	Utah Securities Corporation.....	25	79,565	28,594	108,159	79,565	108,159	82.2	84.3	82.2	84.3
1	Beaver River Power Co.....	1	2,500	2,500	82,665	110,659	2.6	2	84.8	86.3
11	L. L. Nunn.....	4	1,550	420	1,970	83,615	112,629	1.6	1.5	86.4	87.8
49	Municipal stations.....	22	7,151	650	7,801	90,766	120,430	7.4	6	93.8	93.8
	All other stations.....	24	5,968	1,950	7,918	96,734	128,348	6.2	6.2	100	100
	Total.....	76	96,734	31,614	128,348	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	74,688	27,185	101,874
VERMONT.											
41	New England Power Co. of Maine.....	3	31,300	700	32,000	31,300	32,000	26.5	21.9	26.5	21.9
96	International Paper Co.....	3	16,600	1,925	18,525	47,900	50,525	14.1	12.7	40.6	34.6
57	C. H. Tenney & Co.....	7	8,964	8,370	17,334	56,864	67,859	7.6	11.9	48.2	46.5
2	American Gas Co.....	2	13,000	1,330	14,330	69,864	82,189	11	9.8	59.2	56.3
6	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Inc.).....	8	8,975	4,625	13,600	78,839	95,789	7.6	9.3	66.8	65.6
66	Vermont Marble Co.....	6	8,700	1,700	10,400	87,639	106,189	7.4	7.1	74.2	72.7
99	Missisquoi Pulp Co.....	1	4,400	200	4,600	91,939	110,789	3.7	3.2	77.9	75.9
37	Middle West Utilities Co.....	3	1,988	2,020	4,008	93,927	114,797	1.7	2.8	79.6	78.7
93	American Woolen Co.....	1	2,844	2,844	96,771	117,641	2.4	2	82	80.7
4	American Pipe & Construction Co.....	1	2,250	530	2,780	99,021	120,421	1.9	1.9	83.9	82.4
76	Woodbury Granite Co.....	3	1,250	1,330	2,580	100,271	123,001	1.1	1.8	85	84.4
94	Dalton Paper Mills.....	1	2,103	2,103	102,374	125,104	1.8	1.4	86.8	85.8
46	Newport Electric Light Co.....	1	1,600	300	1,900	103,974	127,004	1.4	1.3	88.2	87.1
95	Green Mountain Pulp Co.....	1	1,700	1,700	105,674	128,704	1.4	1.2	89.6	88.3
33	Lyman Falls Power Co.....	1	1,336	1,336	107,010	130,040	1.1	.9	90.7	89.2
80	Municipal stations.....	13	4,910	1,830	6,740	111,820	136,780	4.2	4.6	94.9	93.8
	All other stations.....	47	5,969	3,105	9,074	117,889	145,854	5.1	6.2	100	100
	Total.....	102	117,889	127,965	145,854	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	39,927	18,091	58,018
VIRGINIA.											
55	Virginia Railway & Power Co.....	4	19,000	46,420	65,420	19,000	65,420	20.2	31.4	20.2	31.4
7	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	3	20,900	7,500	28,400	39,900	93,820	22.1	13.6	42.3	45
86	Riverside & Dan River Cotton Mills.....	2	13,270	11,500	24,770	53,170	118,590	14.1	11.9	56.4	56.9
2	American Railways Co.....	4	7,650	9,500	17,150	60,820	135,740	8.1	8.2	64.5	65.1
35	Newport News & Hampton Railway, Gas & Electric Co.....	2	8,280	8,280	60,820	144,020	4	64.5	69.1
59	Virginia Western Power Co.....	5	3,750	2,525	6,275	64,570	150,295	4	3	68.5	72.1
29	Municipal Service Co.....	4	1,900	3,555	5,455	66,470	155,750	2	2.6	70.5	74.7
49	Spottsylvania Power Co.....	1	4,500	4,500	70,970	160,250	4.8	2.2	75.3	76.9
86	The Warren-Burnham Co.....	1	4,000	4,000	70,970	164,250	1.9	75.3	78.8
83	The Bedford Pulp & Paper Co.....	1	3,400	3,400	74,370	167,650	3.6	1.6	78.9	80.4
89	The Washington & Old Dominion R. R. Co.....	1	3,300	3,300	74,370	170,950	1.6	78.9	82
37	Norfolk Southern R. R. Co.....	1	3,000	3,000	74,370	173,950	1.5	78.9	83.5
10	Charlottesville & Albemarle Ry. Co.....	1	2,300	2,300	74,370	176,250	1.1	78.9	84.6
18	Emporia Hydro-Electric Power Co.....	1	1,500	1,500	75,870	177,750	1.6	.7	80.5	85.3
68	Municipal stations.....	15	6,124	6,278	12,402	81,994	190,152	6.5	6	87	91.3
	All other stations.....	44	12,235	5,969	18,194	94,229	208,346	13	8.7	100	100
	Total.....	90	94,229	114,117	208,346	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	66,399	94,090	160,489

¹ Totals include 28,016 water horsepower and 2,125 steam horsepower; total, 30,141 horsepower used in manufactures.

² Totals include 17,830 water horsepower and 15,500 steam horsepower; total, 33,330 horsepower used in manufactures.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent—Continued.

Reference numbers.	Name of company.	Individual totals.				Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
		Number of stations.	Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
WASHINGTON.											
62	Stone & Webster.....	11	85,300	38,160	123,460	85,300	123,460	25.8	29.1	25.8	29.1
83	Washington Water Power Co.....	4	92,900	16,000	108,900	178,200	232,360	28	25.6	53.8	54.7
59	Spokane & Inland Empire R. R. Co.....	1	20,000	20,000	198,200	252,360	6	4.7	59.8	59.4
1	American Power & Light Co.....	11	13,888	5,936	19,824	212,088	272,184	4.2	4.7	64	64.1
46	Northwestern Electric Co.....	1	18,000	18,000	230,088	290,184	5.4	4.2	69.4	68.3
53	Olympic Power Co.....	1	9,600	9,600	239,688	299,784	2.9	2.3	72.3	70.6
114	Great Northern Railroad Co.....	1	8,500	8,500	248,188	308,284	2.6	2	74.9	72.6
38	Lewiston-Clarkston Improvement Co.....	1	3,300	2,330	5,630	251,488	313,914	1	1.3	75.9	73.9
89	Wenatchee Valley Gas & Electric Co.....	3	4,800	4,800	256,288	318,714	1.5	1.1	77.4	75
30	Inland Portland Cement Co.....	1	4,000	4,000	260,288	322,714	1.2	1	78.6	76
25	Federal Light & Traction Co.....	1	3,500	3,500	260,288	326,2148	78.6	76.8
81	Washington-Oregon Corporation.....	2	970	2,000	2,970	261,258	329,184	.3	.7	78.9	77.5
98	Municipal stations.....	12	54,510	13,450	67,960	315,768	397,144	16.5	16	95.4	93.5
	All other stations.....	66	15,366	12,344	27,710	331,134	424,854	4.6	6.5	100	100
	Total.....	116	331,134	93,720	424,854	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	269,641	72,060	341,701
WEST VIRGINIA.											
53	Virginia Power Co.....	1	20,000	20,000	20,000	14.4	14.4
26	General Utilities Operating Co.....	1	13,300	13,300	33,300	9.6	24
1	American Gas & Electric Co.....	2	12,500	12,500	45,800	9	33
74	Union Carbide Co.....	2	11,750	11,750	11,750	57,550	49.4	8.4	49.4	41.4
7	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Inc.).....	4	11,000	11,000	11,750	68,550	7.9	49.4	49.3
5	American Water Works & Electric Co. (Inc.).....	2	9,192	9,192	11,750	77,742	6.6	49.4	55.9
46	Northern Virginia Power Co.....	2	4,750	2,833	7,583	16,500	85,325	20	5.4	69.4	61.3
3	American Railways Co.....	1	6,670	6,670	16,500	91,995	4.8	69.4	66.1
14	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	2	6,050	6,050	16,500	98,045	4.3	69.4	70.4
68	Consolidated Coal Co. (Inc.).....	1	6,000	6,000	16,500	104,045	4.3	69.4	74.7
35	Martinsburg Power Co.....	1	2,250	2,000	4,250	18,750	108,295	9.4	3	78.8	77.7
38	Monongahela Valley Traction Co.....	1	4,000	4,000	18,750	112,295	2.9	78.8	80.6
70	Harpers Ferry Paper Co.....	1	2,400	2,400	21,150	114,695	10.1	1.7	88.9	82.3
73	Shenandoah Pulp Co.....	1	2,000	2,000	23,150	116,695	8.4	1.4	97.3	83.7
31	Kanawha Traction & Electric Co.....	1	2,000	2,000	23,150	118,695	1.4	97.3	85.1
61	Municipal stations.....	6	1,755	1,755	23,150	120,450	1.3	97.3	86.4
	All other stations.....	47	637	18,313	18,950	23,787	139,400	2.7	13.6	100	100
	Total.....	76	23,787	115,613	139,400	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	6,036	62,889	68,925
WISCONSIN.											
124	North American Co.....	9	450	112,355	112,805	450	112,805	.2	25.5	.2	25.5
35	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	2	26,800	26,800	27,250	139,605	11.5	6.1	11.7	31.6
197	Wisconsin River Power Co.....	1	25,000	25,000	52,250	164,605	10.7	5.6	22.4	37.2
9	American Public Utilities Co.....	6	13,350	3,695	17,045	65,600	181,650	5.7	3.8	28.1	41
47, 296	Consolidated Water Power & Paper Co.....	2	16,500	300	16,800	82,100	198,450	7.1	3.8	35.2	44.8
300	Kimberley-Clark Co.....	6	13,450	13,450	95,550	211,900	5.8	3	41	47.8
7	American Light & Traction Co.....	2	5,600	6,356	11,956	101,150	223,856	2.4	2.7	43.4	50.5
167	Southern Wisconsin Power Co.....	1	11,000	11,000	112,150	234,856	4.7	2.5	48.1	53
114	Nokoosa-Port Edwards Paper Co.....	3	10,700	80	10,780	122,850	245,636	4.6	2.4	52.7	55.4
198	Wisconsin Securities Co.....	2	8,000	2,470	10,470	130,850	256,106	3.4	2.4	56.1	57.8
196	Wisconsin Railway, Light & Power Co.....	1	8,000	8,000	138,850	264,106	3.4	1.8	59.5	59.6
200	Wisconsin Traction, Light, Heat & Power Co.....	1	2,550	5,330	7,880	141,400	271,986	1.1	1.8	60.6	61.4
68	Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co.....	1	6,100	900	7,000	147,500	278,986	2.6	1.6	63.2	63
295	Combined Locks Paper Co.....	1	6,100	900	7,000	153,600	285,986	2.6	1.6	65.8	64.6
98	Menasha Woodware Co.....	2	5,600	1,400	7,000	159,200	292,986	2.4	1.6	68.2	66.2
43	Commonwealth Paper Co.....	1	6,500	6,500	159,200	299,486	1.5	68.2	67.7
321	Warsaw Paper Mills Co.....	1	4,756	600	5,356	163,956	304,842	2	1.2	70.2	68.9
323	Wisconsin River Pulp & Paper Co.....	1	5,300	5,300	169,256	310,142	2.3	1.2	72.5	70.1
209	Marathon Paper Mills Co.....	1	5,000	5,000	174,256	315,142	2.1	1.1	74.6	71.2
202	Municipal stations.....	85	3,143	15,034	18,177	177,399	333,319	1.4	4.1	76	75.3
	All other stations.....	195	56,170	53,207	109,377	233,569	442,696	24	24.7	100	100
	Total.....	324	233,569	209,127	442,696	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	94,284	177,779	272,063
WYOMING.											
23	Union Pacific Coal Co.....	3	3,900	3,900	3,900	22.3	22.3
7	Federal Light & Traction Co.....	2	3,825	3,825	7,725	21.9	44.2
27	Western Light & Power Co.....	1	1,565	1,565	9,290	9	53.2
19	Penn-Wyoming Copper Co.....	1	500	1,170	500	10,460	19.7	6.7	19.7	59.9
4	Cambria Fuel Co. of Wyoming.....	2	770	770	500	11,230	4.4	19.7	64.3
15	Intermountain Railway, Light & Power Co.....	1	700	700	500	11,930	4	19.7	68.3
18	Natrona County Electric Co.....	1	650	650	500	12,580	3.7	19.7	72
14	Hot Springs Light & Power Co.....	1	400	200	600	900	13,180	15.7	3.4	35.4	75.4
22	Shoshone Electric Light & Power Co.....	1	400	400	1,300	13,580	15.7	2.3	51.1	77.7
10, 29	United States Army and municipal stations.....	5	864	371	1,235	2,164	14,815	34	7.1	85.1	84.8
	All other stations.....	16	380	2,285	2,665	2,544	17,480	14.9	15.2	100	100
	Total.....	34	2,544	14,936	17,480	100	100
	Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....	1,334	10,262	11,596

¹ Totals include 74,196 water horsepower and 8,360 steam horsepower; total, 82,856 horsepower used in manufactures.

TABLE 3.—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.—Continued.

No.	Name of company.	No. of States.	No. of stations.	Individual totals.			Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
				Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
1	Stone & Webster.....	13	62	340,211	189,643	529,854	340,211	529,854	6.36	3.56	6.36	3.56
2	Commonwealth Edison Co. (Illinois).....	1	4	511,150	511,150	511,150	340,211	1,041,004	3.44	6.36	7.00	7.00
3	Consolidated Gas Co. (New York).....	1	8	481,895	481,895	481,895	340,211	1,522,899	3.24	6.36	10.24	10.24
4	North American Co.....	3	30	5,583	420,377	425,960	345,704	1,948,899	.11	2.86	6.47	13.10
5	H. M. Byllesby & Co.....	17	53	116,155	160,341	276,496	461,949	2,225,355	2.17	1.86	8.64	14.96
6	E. W. Clark & Co., Mortgage Corporation.....	4	36	162,330	103,365	265,695	624,279	2,461,050	3.04	1.79	11.68	16.75
7	Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (California).....	1	13	152,080	108,540	260,620	776,359	2,751,670	2.84	1.75	14.52	18.50
8	Interborough Metropolitan Co. (New York).....	1	2	246,500	246,500	246,500	776,359	2,998,170	1.66	1.57	14.52	20.16
9	Public Service Corporation of New Jersey.....	1	16	232,905	232,905	232,905	776,359	3,231,075	1.57	1.57	14.52	21.73
10	Doherty Operating Co.....	14	43	43,100	180,401	223,501	819,459	3,454,570	.81	1.50	15.33	23.23
11	Southern Power Co. (South Carolina and North Carolina).....	2	9	157,850	47,010	204,860	977,309	3,659,436	2.95	1.38	18.28	24.61
12	Utah Securities Corporation.....	3	43	171,702	30,374	202,076	1,149,011	3,861,512	3.21	1.36	21.49	25.97
13	Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co. (New York).....	1	5	198,025	198,025	198,025	1,149,011	4,059,537	1.33	1.33	21.49	27.30
14	Pacific Light & Power Corporation (California).....	1	13	117,950	79,300	197,250	1,266,961	4,256,787	2.21	1.32	23.70	28.62
15	Montana Power Co.....	1	19	179,700	8,300	188,000	1,446,661	4,444,787	3.36	1.27	27.06	29.89
16	International Paper Co.....	5	23	156,830	29,945	186,775	1,603,491	4,631,562	2.94	1.25	30.00	31.14
17	United Gas & Electric Corporation of Connecticut.....	9	17	5,250	181,110	186,360	1,608,741	4,817,922	.09	1.25	30.09	32.39
18	Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co. The Philadelphia Co. (Pennsylvania).....	4	47	70,813	112,160	182,973	1,679,554	5,000,895	1.32	1.24	31.41	33.63
19	Hydraulic Power Co. of Niagara Falls.....	1	10	161,508	161,508	161,508	1,679,554	5,162,403	1.08	1.08	31.41	34.71
20	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. (Massachusetts).....	1	3	153,000	153,000	153,000	1,832,554	5,315,403	2.86	1.03	34.27	35.74
21	Central States Electric Corporation (Ohio).....	1	3	140,850	140,850	140,850	1,832,554	5,456,253	.95	.95	34.27	36.69
22	Southern California Edison Co.....	1	11	56,400	79,120	135,520	1,832,554	5,591,953	1.06	.91	34.27	37.60
23	Georgia Railway & Power Co.....	1	7	100,400	33,720	134,120	1,888,954	5,727,473	1.88	.91	35.33	38.51
24	Boston Electric Railways Co. (Massachusetts).....	1	6	126,300	126,300	126,300	1,989,354	5,981,593	1.88	.90	37.21	39.41
25	Washington Water Power Co.....	2	5	109,200	16,000	125,200	2,098,554	6,113,093	2.04	.85	37.21	40.26
26	Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.....	1	2	118,000	118,000	118,000	2,216,554	6,231,093	2.21	.79	39.25	41.11
27	The Niagara Falls Power Co. (New York).....	1	2	115,000	115,000	115,000	2,331,554	6,346,093	2.15	.77	41.46	41.90
28	Western Power Co. (California).....	1	4	73,330	38,670	112,000	2,404,884	6,458,093	1.37	.76	43.61	43.43
29	American Gas & Electric Co.....	5	20	109,970	109,970	109,970	2,404,884	6,568,083	.74	.74	44.08	44.17
30	Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co.....	1	5	105,730	105,730	105,730	2,404,884	6,673,793	.71	.71	44.98	44.83
31	New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.....	3	16	8,050	96,500	104,550	2,412,934	6,778,343	.15	.70	45.13	45.58
32	W. S. Barstow & Co. (Incorporated).....	7	32	13,475	82,545	96,020	2,426,409	6,874,363	.25	.65	45.38	46.23
33	New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.....	1	4	22,325	70,800	93,125	2,448,734	6,967,483	.42	.62	45.80	46.85
34	American Power & Light Co.....	4	40	22,978	69,221	92,199	2,471,712	7,059,687	.43	.62	46.23	47.47
35	Twin City Rapid Transit Co. (Minnesota).....	1	3	25,000	66,700	91,700	2,496,712	7,151,387	.47	.62	46.70	48.09
36	Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co.....	1	7	72,500	18,920	91,420	2,569,212	7,242,807	1.35	.61	48.05	48.70
37	United Railways Investment Co. (California).....	1	5	65,600	25,330	90,930	2,634,812	7,333,737	1.23	.61	49.28	49.31
38	Middle West Utilities Co.....	9	118	16,824	69,890	86,714	2,651,636	7,420,451	.31	.59	49.59	49.90
39	Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	2	2	85,370	85,370	85,370	2,651,636	7,505,821	.57	.57	49.59	50.47
40	New England Power Co. of Maine.....	2	7	80,700	700	81,400	2,732,336	7,587,221	1.51	.55	51.10	51.02
41	Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co. (Pennsylvania).....	1	4	5,367	70,500	75,867	2,737,703	7,663,088	.10	.51	51.20	51.53
42	Kings County Electric Light & Power Co. (New York).....	1	3	74,570	74,570	74,570	2,737,703	7,737,758	.50	.50	51.20	52.03
43	San Joaquin Light & Power Corporation (California).....	1	8	40,150	28,950	69,100	2,777,853	7,806,558	.75	.47	51.95	52.50
44	Ohio Traction Co.....	1	6	65,611	65,611	65,611	2,777,853	7,872,469	.44	.44	51.95	52.91
45	Virginia Railway & Power Co.....	1	4	19,000	65,420	84,420	2,796,853	7,937,889	.36	.44	52.31	53.38
46	Illinois Traction Co.....	3	36	4,415	59,026	63,441	2,801,268	8,001,330	.08	.42	52.39	53.80
47	United Railways & Electric Co. of Baltimore.....	1	4	61,875	61,875	61,875	2,801,268	8,063,205	.42	.42	52.39	54.22
48	Northwestern Power Co. (Minnesota).....	1	2	57,000	4,670	61,670	2,853,268	8,124,875	1.07	.42	53.46	54.44
49	C. H. Tenney & Co.....	4	18	10,730	50,728	61,458	2,868,998	8,186,333	.20	.41	53.66	55.05
50	Pub. Service Co. of Northern Illinois.....	1	13	5,300	55,930	61,230	2,874,298	8,247,563	.10	.41	53.76	55.46
51	American Water Works & Electric Co.....	3	14	59,097	59,097	59,097	2,874,298	8,306,860	.40	.40	53.76	55.86
52	Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. (Maryland).....	1	7	1,000	56,710	57,710	2,875,298	8,364,370	.02	.39	53.78	56.25
53	Massachusetts Electric Cos.....	1	13	57,575	57,575	57,575	2,875,298	8,421,945	.38	.38	53.78	56.63
54	Pillsbury Flour Mills Co. (Minnesota).....	1	2	57,500	57,500	57,500	2,932,798	8,479,445	1.07	.38	54.85	57.01
55	Washington Railway & Electric Co. (District of Columbia).....	1	1	53,800	53,800	53,800	2,932,798	8,533,245	.37	.37	54.85	57.38
56	Kansas City Railway & Light Co. (Missouri).....	1	1	53,300	53,300	53,300	2,932,798	8,586,545	.36	.36	54.85	57.74
57	Carolina Power & Light Co. (North Carolina).....	1	9	44,400	7,725	52,125	2,977,198	8,638,670	.83	.35	55.68	58.03
58	American Gas Co.....	5	17	15,525	36,350	51,875	2,992,723	8,690,545	.29	.35	55.97	58.44
59	United Light & Railways Co.....	2	7	500	50,025	50,525	2,993,223	8,741,070	.01	.34	55.98	58.73
60	New England Investment Co. (Massachusetts).....	1	4	49,400	49,400	49,400	3,012,623	8,790,470	.93	.33	56.91	59.11
61	Nevada-California Power Co. (California).....	1	7	37,750	10,670	48,420	3,030,373	8,838,890	.70	.33	57.61	59.44
62	Detroit United Railways.....	1	9	46,986	46,986	46,986	3,080,373	8,889,876	.32	.32	57.61	59.76
63	Colorado Power Co.....	1	7	41,750	4,870	46,620	3,122,123	8,931,496	.78	.31	58.39	60.07
64	J. G. White & Co.....	4	17	20,880	25,699	46,579	3,143,003	8,978,975	.39	.31	58.78	60.38
65	American Public Utilities Co.....	3	9	13,350	31,895	45,245	3,156,353	9,014,230	.25	.30	59.03	60.63
66	American Light & Traction Co.....	4	5	13,400	31,584	44,984	3,169,753	9,069,204	.25	.30	59.28	60.98
67	Louisville Traction Co.....	1	2	44,130	44,130	44,130	3,169,753	9,113,334	.30	.30	59.28	61.28
68	United Gas Improvement Co.....	4	9	350	43,611	43,961	3,170,103	9,157,325	.01	.30	59.29	61.53
69	Chattanooga & Tennessee Railway Power Co. (Tennessee).....	1	1	42,000	42,000	42,000	3,212,103	9,199,325	.79	.23	60.08	61.83
70	National Securities Corporation.....	2	4	39,350	2,000	41,350	3,251,453	9,240,675	.73	.23	60.81	62.14
71	Indianapolis Light & Heat Co.....	1	1	40,900	40,900	40,900	3,251,453	9,281,575	.27	.27	60.81	62.41
72	New York Lockport & Ontario Power Co. (New York).....	1	1	40,000	40,000	40,000	3,291,453	9,321,575	.75	.27	61.56	62.68
73	Aluminum Co. of America (New York).....	1	2	40,000	40,000	40,000	3,331,453	9,351,575	.75	.27	62.31	62.95
74	Columbia Gas & Electric Co. (Ohio).....	1	1	38,930	38,930	38,930	3,331,453	9,400,505	.26	.26	62.31	63.24
75	Georgia Light, Power & Railway Co.....	1	3	33,000	4,750	37,750	3,364,453	9,438,255	.62	.26	62.93	63.47
76	Turners Falls Power Co. (Massachusetts).....	1	2	36,900	36,900	36,900	3,401,353	9,475,155	.69	.24	63.62	63.71
77	Pacific Lighting Corporation (California).....	1	1	34,202	34,202	34,202	3,401,353	9,509,357	.23	.23	63.62	63.94
78	Columbia Railway, Gas & Electric Co. (South Carolina).....	1	2	26,000	7,330	33,330	3,427,353	9,542,687	.48	.23	64.10	64.17

TABLE 3—Concentration of power development in the several States, showing amounts of water power, steam and gas power, and of total power controlled by certain corporations and by municipalities, in horsepower and in per cent.—Continued.

UNITED STATES—continued.

No.	Name of company.	No. of States.	No. of stations.	Individual totals.			Cumulative totals.		Individual percentages.		Cumulative percentages.	
				Water power.	Steam and gas power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.	Water power.	All power.
80	Northern Ohio Traction & Lighting Co.....		2	2,270	31,000	33,270	3,429,623	9,575,957	0.04	0.22	64.14	64.39
81	United Properties Co. (California).....	1	6	33,025	33,025	33,025	3,429,623	9,608,982	.22	.22	64.14	64.61
82	Federal Light & Traction Co.....	7	12	32,373	32,373	32,373	3,429,623	9,641,355	.22	.22	64.14	64.83
83	Fort Wayne & Northern Indiana Traction Co.....	1	3	32,160	32,160	32,160	3,429,623	9,673,515	.22	.22	64.14	65.05
84	United Illuminating Co. (Connecticut).....	1	2	31,200	31,200	31,200	3,429,623	9,704,715	.21	.21	64.14	65.26
85	General Electric Co. (New York).....	1	3	31,000	31,000	31,000	3,460,623	9,735,715	.58	.21	64.72	65.47
86	Union Carbide Co. (Michigan).....	1	1	30,800	30,800	30,800	3,491,423	9,766,515	.58	.20	65.30	65.67
87	Cohoes Co. (New York).....	1	1	30,000	30,000	30,000	3,521,423	9,796,515	.56	.20	65.86	65.87
Total for 87 corporations.....		48	1,042	3,521,423	6,275,092	9,796,515	3,521,423	9,796,515	65.86	65.87	65.86	65.87
Municipal stations.....		48	1,000	231,525	496,984	728,509	3,752,948	10,525,024	4.33	4.90	70.19	70.77
All other stations.....		48	4,299	1,593,751	2,752,367	4,346,118	5,346,699	14,871,142	29.81	29.23	100	100
Grand total.....			6,941	5,346,699	9,524,443	14,871,142						
Total manufacturing power included.....				736,197	172,210	908,407						
Central stations and electric railways, 1915.....				4,610,502	9,352,233	13,962,735						
Central stations and electric railways, 1912.....				2,942,388	8,251,311	11,193,699						
Increase 1912 to 1915.....				1,668,114	1,100,922	2,769,036						
Percent of increase.....				36.2	11.8	19.8						

NOTE.—All but 2 of the corporations listed hereon, the International Paper Co. (16) and the Union Carbide Co. (86), are engaged in public-service operations.

A more simple and easily understood compilation has likewise been made for the several States as to who the large owners are in each State, what per cent of the developed power they own, what relation it bears to the whole, and it would seem to me that from time to time students of the water-power problem, as well as those seeking development in a given State, would find the following summary of value. It is as follows:

ALABAMA.

One company, the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co., has 87.9 per cent of the developed water power and 57.1 per cent of the total power of the State. Eight corporations control 90.1 per cent of the total power, and three of these 98.8 per cent of the water power. Thirty-four municipalities have but 0.8 per cent of the water power and 4.7 per cent of the total power.

ARIZONA.

Five companies control 47.4 per cent of the total power. Only one of these, the Arizona Power Co., has developed any water power. It has 26.8 per cent of the total for the State. The greater part of the developed water power is owned by the United States Reclamation Service, which, together with two municipalities, has 72.1 per cent of the water power and 27.6 per cent of the total power.

ARKANSAS.

Water power affords but little over 4 per cent of the total power. So far as data of developed water power could be secured, the total appears to be owned by two companies. Eleven companies control 73.5 per cent of the total power from all sources. The 17 municipal power stations have no water power and but 9.9 per cent of the total power in the State.

CALIFORNIA.

Fifteen corporations control 88.6 per cent of the total primary power in the State, and 12 control 87.8 per cent of all the developed water power. Of these the largest is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., with 20.1 per cent of the water power, or 152,080 horsepower, and 20.5 per cent of the total power, or 260,620 horsepower. Four corporations, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the Pacific Light & Power Corporation, the Southern California Edison Co., and the Western Power Co. together control more than half of both the water power and the total power in the State. Municipal developments comprise 6.3 per cent of the water power and 4.5 per cent of the total power.

COLORADO.

Eight corporations control 73 per cent of the total power, and five of these control 77 per cent of the water power. The largest is the Colorado Power Co., with 45.2 per cent of the water power and 24 per cent of the total power. This company, together with the Doherty Operating Co., the Utah Securities Corporation, and H. M. Byllesby & Co., control 68 per cent of the water power and 54.4 per cent of the total power. Ten municipalities own only 1.1 per cent of the water power and 1.9 per cent of the total power.

CONNECTICUT.

Eight corporations control 92.7 per cent of the developed water power. Of these, one concern, Stone & Webster, controls 38.2 per cent. Four companies, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., the United Illuminating Co., the Hartford Electric Light Co., and Stone & Webster, control 63 per cent of the water power in the State. These four, together with 11 others, control 87.1 per cent of the total power. The six municipal plants have no water power and but 5.6 per cent of the total power.

The National Properties Co. controls 81.8 per cent of the total electric-power installation for which data have been secured. Six municipalities have 8.5 per cent. Water-power development is negligible.

FLORIDA.

Two concerns, Stone & Webster and the Florida Power Co., control 99.6 per cent of the developed water power and 32.7 per cent of the

total power. Eight companies control 58.6 per cent of the total power. Seventeen municipalities control 26.6 per cent of the total power, but have no water power.

GEORGIA.

Four companies, the Georgia Railway & Power Co., Stone & Webster, the Georgia Light, Power & Railways Co., and J. G. White & Co. (Inc.), control 84.4 per cent of the developed water power and 73.8 per cent of the total power. Twelve companies control 88.1 per cent of the total power, and 10 of these control 93.7 per cent of the water power. Seventy-five municipalities own but 0.7 per cent of the water power and 5.2 per cent of the total power. Of the total power for the State as shown on the summary table, 5.8 per cent is used in manufacturing. On account of this inclusion the percentages of control of strictly public-service power by certain corporations are greater than the above figures would indicate.

IDAHO.

The Utah Securities Corporation controls 48.3 per cent of the developed water power and 45.5 per cent of the total power. This company together with the National Securities Corporation control 70.8 per cent of the water power and 67.9 per cent of the total power in the State. The United States Reclamation Service and four municipalities control 9.4 per cent of the water power and 8.8 per cent of the total power.

ILLINOIS.

Only 29.1 per cent of the developed water power is controlled by the major corporations. Of the total power, however, 89.2 per cent is controlled by 13 public-service corporations, one of which, the Commonwealth Edison Co., controls 55.6 per cent of the total developed power. Eighty-six municipalities, including the Chicago sanitary district, have 63.4 per cent of the developed water power and 6 per cent of the total power.

INDIANA.

This State has a relatively small water-power development. Of such development as has been made, 70.5 per cent is controlled by the Middle West Utilities Co. and the Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., the former with 54.4 per cent, the latter with 16.1 per cent. Thirteen corporations control 75 per cent of the total power while 70 municipalities have but 2.5 per cent of the water power and 9 per cent of the total power.

IOWA.

Stone & Webster control 94.1 per cent of the total developed water power, equivalent to 47.4 per cent of the total power in the State. Thirteen corporations together control 80.7 per cent of the total power and five of these 96.1 per cent of the water power. Seventy municipalities have 0.4 per cent of the water power and 5.3 per cent of the total power.

KANSAS.

The Doherty Operating Co. controls 59.9 per cent of the developed water power. This company with two others controls 81.4 per cent of the water power. Seven concerns control 46.7 per cent of the total power in the State. Ninety municipal stations have 1.1 per cent of the water power and 24 per cent of the total power.

KENTUCKY.

As far as data are available there is no water-power development in this State by central stations or electric railways. Two companies, the Louisville Traction Co. and H. M. Byllesby & Co., control 60.6 per cent of the total developed steam power. Eleven companies control 84.7 per cent of the total power, and 18 municipalities 6 per cent.

LOUISIANA.

This State has no water-power development of consequence. One concern, the United Gas & Electric Corporation, of Connecticut, controls 73.4 per cent of the total developed power from all sources. Six companies control 85.1 per cent. Twenty-five municipalities have 8.9 per cent of the total for the State.

MAINE.

Over 58 per cent, chiefly water power, of the total power shown for the State of Maine is used in manufacturing. Of the total thus shown

the largest percentages are controlled by the E. W. Clark Management Corporation, with 13.4 per cent of the water power and 16.4 per cent of the total power, and the International Paper Co. with 16.5 per cent of the water power and 15.9 per cent of the total power. Sixteen concerns control 91.1 per cent of the water power and 91 per cent of the total power. Five municipalities have only 0.7 per cent of the water power and 0.8 per cent of the total power.

MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Water-power developments are of little importance, affording but 1.5 per cent of the total developed power. Nine companies control 94.9 per cent of the total power, and three of these—the United Railways & Electric Co. of Baltimore, the Consolidated Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore, and the Washington Railway & Electric Co.—control 78.8 per cent of the total developed power. Seven municipal stations in Maryland have but 1.1 per cent of the total power developed in the State and District of Columbia combined.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Nineteen corporations control 83.5 per cent of the total power in the State, and eight of these control 77.8 per cent of the water power. Two companies—the New England Power Co. of Maine and the Turners Falls Power & Electric Co.—control 56.2 per cent of the developed water power. Thirty-three municipal stations have 0.8 per cent of the water power and 4.2 per cent of the total power.

MICHIGAN.

Eighteen corporations control 79.5 per cent of the total developed power and 15 of these control 76.2 per cent of the developed water power. Two concerns—the North American Co. and the Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.—control 53 per cent of the total power; and two—the Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co. and the Union Carbide Co.—control 47.6 per cent of the water power. One hundred and four municipalities own 5.1 per cent of the developed water power and 8.8 per cent of the total power. Of the total power for the State, as given in the summary tables, 4.2 per cent is used in manufacturing. Were it not for this inclusion the percentage of control by certain companies of strictly public-service power would be somewhat greater than the above figures indicate.

MINNESOTA.

Twelve companies control 89.9 per cent of the water power and 82.2 per cent of the total power. Four of these control 71.9 per cent of the water power and 65.4 per cent of the total power. One hundred and fifteen municipalities have only one-half of 1 per cent of the water power and 5.7 per cent of the total power.

MISSISSIPPI.

So far as data are available Mississippi has no water power developed by public-service corporations. In the total power there is no marked concentration, the largest amount controlled by one concern—the Gulfport & Mississippi Coast Traction Co.—being 14.1 per cent. Forty-two municipal stations have 25 per cent of the total power of the State.

MISSOURI.

Nine corporations control 86.3 per cent of the total power and one—the Doherty Operating Co.—controls 98.7 per cent of the water power. Three companies—the North American Co., the Doherty Operating Co., and the Kansas City Railway & Light Co.—control 78 per cent of the total power in the State. Six per cent of the total is developed in municipal stations.

MONTANA.

Four corporations control 97.4 per cent of the water power and 91.8 per cent of the total power. Two of these—the Montana Power Co. and the Amalgamated Copper Co., affiliated concerns—control 94.4 per cent of the water power and 88.7 per cent of the total power. Municipal plants have no water power and but four-tenths of 1 per cent of the total power.

NEBRASKA.

Only 23.6 per cent of the developed water power is controlled by the major electric power corporations. The most important of these corporations are the Omaha Electric Light & Power Co. and the Omaha & Council Bluffs Street Railway Co. These two companies control 48 per cent of the public-service power in the State, but have no water power. The 73 municipal stations have 46.8 per cent of the developed water power and 19.7 per cent of the total power.

NEVADA.

One concern, Stone & Webster, controls 73.6 per cent of the water power. This company, together with the Utah Copper Co., control 74.1 per cent of the total power in the State. Eighteen and seven-tenths per cent of the water power is owned by the United States Reclamation Service. There are no municipal developments, although one town purchases and distributes power.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Three manufacturing concerns, the Berlin Mills Co., the Amoskeag Manufacturing Co., and the International Paper Co., have 64 per cent of the developed water power and 48 per cent of the total power. Fourteen companies, both manufacturing and public service, control 88.1 per cent of the water power and 85.9 per cent of the total power. Two municipalities have 0.6 per cent of the water power and 0.8 per cent of the total power.

NEW JERSEY.

Less than 3 per cent of the total power in the State is water power. Of this amount 87.5 per cent is controlled by two companies, the New Jersey General Security Co. and W. S. Barstow & Co. Of the total power, 68.6 per cent is controlled by one concern, the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey. Nine other concerns together control 17.2 per cent of the total power. Ten municipalities have 1.1 per cent of the water power and 0.9 per cent of the total power.

NEW MEXICO.

Water powers afford less than 4 per cent of the total developed power. Of the total power the Federal Light & Traction Co. controls 37.1 per cent. Eight companies together have 66.9 per cent of the total. The United States Reclamation Service and certain municipalities, with four stations, have 22.9 per cent of the total developed power.

NEW YORK.

Twenty corporations control 81.4 per cent of the total developed power and 14 of these control 74.3 per cent of the developed water power. Five companies control over one-half of the total power and two over one-third of the water power. Forty-eight municipalities have 0.4 per cent of the water power and 0.6 per cent of the total power. Of

the totals for the State, as appearing on the summary table, nearly 12 per cent is power used in manufacturing. If this were omitted from the totals the percentage of total public-service power controlled by the five largest corporations would be nearly 60 per cent and of public-service water power by the two largest water-power companies, 45 per cent.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Two companies, the Southern Power Co. and the Carolina Power & Light Co., control 75.1 per cent of the developed water power and 66.5 per cent of the total power. Eight corporations control 94 per cent of the water power, and fourteen 89.1 per cent of the total power. Forty-nine municipalities have 1 per cent of the water power and 5.5 per cent of the total power. Since the totals for the State contain a certain amount of power used in manufactures, the percentages of strictly public-service power controlled by the several corporations is greater than the above figures would indicate.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Water-power development in this State is negligible. One concern, H. M. Bylesby & Co., controls 36.7 per cent of the total electric power in 3 stations, as compared with 22.3 per cent controlled by the United States Reclamation Service and certain municipalities in 12 stations.

OHIO.

Ohio shows no marked concentration of electric-power development, although 20 concerns control 77.8 per cent of the total in the State, and 7 of these have 67.1 per cent of the total developed water power. One hundred and fourteen municipalities own 0.9 per cent of the water power and 7.5 per cent of the total power.

OKLAHOMA.

Nine companies control 61.9 per cent of the total power. Water-power development in the State amounts to but little over 2 per cent of the total. Sixty-one municipalities have 20.4 per cent of the water power and 16.7 per cent of the total power.

OREGON.

E. W. Clark & Co. Management Corporation and the Crown-Willamette Paper Co. control 67.7 per cent of the water power and 65.7 per cent of the total power in the State. Seven companies control 86.4 per cent of the water power and 82.5 per cent of the total power. Municipal plants contain 3 per cent of the water power and 2.2 per cent of the total power.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Fifteen corporations control 73 per cent of the total public-service power in the State, and six of these control 88.2 per cent of the water power. One concern, the Pennsylvania Water & Power Co., controls 70 per cent of the developed water power. Forty-one municipalities have 0.3 per cent of the water power and 1.6 per cent of the total power of the State.

RHODE ISLAND.

As far as information is available, Stone & Webster control the entire amount of developed water power used in public-service operations. Four companies—the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., the Narragansett Electric Lighting Co., the Massachusetts Lighting Companies, and Stone & Webster—control 98.3 per cent of the total public-service power in the State. There appear to be no municipal developments.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

One concern, the Southern Power Co., controls 56.3 per cent of the developed water power and 50 per cent of the total power. Twelve companies control 96.4 per cent of the water power and thirteen 92.3 per cent of the total power. The 21 municipal plants have no water power and but 1.7 per cent of the total power. As noted in the summary table for the State, 9.6 per cent of the power included in the totals is used in manufacturing. The percentage of strictly public-service power controlled by the several corporations listed is, therefore, greater than the above percentages would indicate.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

The Homestake Mining Co. has 47.8 per cent of the total water power in the State. Three other companies control 43.1 per cent, making a total of 90.9 per cent for the four. The 17 municipal stations have no water power and but 5 per cent of the total power.

TENNESSEE.

Two corporations, the E. W. Clark Co. Management Corporation and the Chattanooga & Tennessee River Power Co., control 88.9 per cent of the developed water power and 62.5 per cent of the total power. Five companies control 98.3 per cent of the water power and nine companies 92.9 per cent of the total power. Twenty-nine municipal plants contain but one-third of 1 per cent of the water power and but 3.7 per cent of the total power.

TEXAS.

Three companies control 68.5 per cent of the water power, and two companies—Stone & Webster and the American Power & Light Co.—control 53 per cent of the total power. Thirteen companies control 77 per cent of the total power. Twenty-one municipalities have 3.3 per cent of the water power and 3.8 per cent of the total power.

UTAH.

One concern, the Utah Securities Corporation, controls 82.2 per cent of the developed water power and 84.3 per cent of the total power. Twenty-two municipalities have 7.4 per cent of the water power and 6 per cent of the total power.

VERMONT.

Two public-service companies, the New England Power Co., of Maine, and the American Gas Co., and one manufacturing concern, the International Paper Co., control 51.6 per cent of the total developed water power and 44.4 per cent of the total power. Fifteen companies control 90.7 per cent of the water power and 89.2 per cent of the total power. Thirteen municipalities have 4.2 per cent of the water power and 4.6 per cent of the total power. As noted for several other States, power used in manufacturing to the extent of 2 per cent of the total has been included. Were it not for this inclusion the percentages of control of public-service power by certain corporations would be considerably greater than would be indicated by the above percentages, or those shown in the summary table for the State.

VIRGINIA.

Two public-service corporations, the Virginia Railway & Power Co. and H. M. Bylesby & Co., and one manufacturing concern, the Riverside & Dan River Cotton Mills, control 56.4 per cent of the developed water power and 56.9 per cent of the total power. Fourteen com-

panies control 85.3 per cent of the total power, and nine of these control 80.5 per cent of the water power. Fifteen municipal stations control 6.5 per cent of the water power and 6 per cent of the total power.

WASHINGTON.

Two concerns, Stone & Webster and the Washington Water Power Co., control 53.8 per cent of the water power and 54.7 per cent of the total power. Ten corporations control 78.6 per cent of the water power and twelve 77.5 per cent of the total power. Washington has a considerable municipal development, 12 cities and towns owning 16.5 per cent of the water power and 16 per cent of the total power in the State.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Five companies control 97.3 per cent of the developed water power, and one concern, the Union Carbide Co., 49.4 per cent. Fifteen companies control 85.1 per cent of the total power. Six municipalities have 1.3 per cent of the total power, but no water power.

WISCONSIN.

Seventy-four and six-tenths per cent of the developed water power is distributed among 18 corporations. The largest percentages in control of single corporations are 11.5 per cent by H. M. Byllesby & Co. and 10.7 per cent by the Wisconsin River Power Co. Similarly 71.2 per cent of the total developed power of the State is distributed among 19 corporations, the North American Co. having the largest individual percentage of 25.5 per cent. Eighty-five municipalities have 1.4 per cent of the water power and 4.1 per cent of the total power. The totals for this State contain a considerable amount—19 per cent of the total—of power used in manufacture, hence the percentages of strictly public-service power controlled by the several companies is greater than the above percentage would indicate.

WYOMING.

Water-power development is of minor importance in Wyoming, the total amounting to only 2,544 horsepower. The total electric-power installation from all sources is less than 18,000 horsepower. Two corporations control 44.2 per cent of this and nine 77.7 per cent. The United States Army and municipal stations utilize 34 per cent of the water power and 7.1 per cent of the total power.

Again, treating the proposition as a whole, I take it that it would be of interest to the Congress, as well as to the American people, to know the names of 18 of the larger owners of water powers in the United States. I accordingly set them out below:

1. Stone & Webster.
2. Montana Power Co.
3. Utah Securities Corporation.
4. E. W. Clark & Co. Management Corporation.
5. Southern Power Co.
6. Hydraulic Co. of Niagara Falls.
7. Pacific Gas & Electric Co.
8. Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.
9. Pacific Light & Power Corporation.
10. H. M. Byllesby & Co.
11. The Niagara Falls Power Co.
12. Washington Water Power Co.
13. Georgia Railway Light & Power Co.
14. New England Power Co. of Maine.
15. Western Power Co.
16. Alabama Traction Light & Power Co.
17. Commonwealth Power, Railway & Light Co.
18. United Railways Investment Co.

I take it that it will likewise be of interest to know that of the approximately 6,000,000 horsepower now developed, the 18 just above enumerated own 2,356,521 water horsepower, more than one-half (51.1 per cent) of the total water power used in public-service operations in the United States. Of the 18 corporations named, the first 9 control more than one-third (33.7 per cent) of the total, and the first 6 more than one-fourth (25.3 per cent).

I hope I display not too much egotism in asking Members interested in water power to consult the hearings held before our committee. I believe they contain almost the last word, at least so far as the development of water power has gone. We had before us the best engineers of this country. We had before us Hon. Franklin K. Lane, a student and a patriot on this subject. We had likewise before us ex-Secretary Fisher, who is a well-known authority on the subject. Also ex-Forester Gifford Pinchot, who is and has been thinking faster than the time in which he lives—he has been quite a pathfinder on this most interesting subject; Dr. George Otis Smith, head of the Geological Survey, a thoroughgoing, patriotic man; and Mr. Merrill, a brilliant student of the subject, from the Agricultural Department. I think it is not too much to say the hearings had before us, taken altogether, are, considering the present state of power development, the last word on the subject. If those interested in the subject will read from page 381 to page 385 of the hearings, they will be amazed at the concentration of capital in water power that has already taken place.

It is as near frenzied finance as can be described. No one would believe such concentration could take place in so short a time. I repeat, water-power development began in 1890, just 24 years ago. It is as yet only in its swaddling clothes.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL IN ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT.

The Public Lands Committee hearings, on pages 381 to 385, disclose that abnormal, unusual, and almost inexplicable concentration has been going on in the water power of this country. It discloses that 90 per cent of the developed water power is

now in the hands of 27 holding companies and 24 operating companies, so interlinked and intertwined with interlocked directorates that it is impossible to separate their interests or to fathom their power. The total amount of securities held by these 27 companies is \$275,000,000. The names of these companies and much information about them appear on pages 656 to 671, inclusive. I do not call attention to this abnormal concentration of capital to startle or amaze, but it is a question worthy of comment and worthy of intelligent thought. It shows that although this Congress may have slumbered in taking steps to provide for the development of water power, that capital and the water-power monopoly have not slept, but have been active, vigilant, and effective in gaining control thereof.

It may not be out of place to show how nonpolitical this water-power question really is. It is not a question for my side of the House to solve, it is not a question for the Republican side of the House to solve, or for the Progressive Party to solve, but it is a question for all of the people to solve. I shall now strive to show you why I make that statement.

If these resources are to be developed, laws must be passed that are reasonably certain and definite, and such as will cause capital to undertake the task. They must, likewise, of course, work hand in hand with conditions that will fully protect the public interest.

TWO KINDS OF WATER POWER.

First, water power developed on the navigable streams of the country more or less interlinked with navigation.

Second, water power developed on the nonnavigable streams where the Federal Government owns the dam site or the public lands over which the rights of way must traverse. The Adamson bill had to do with the former; this bill has to do with the latter.

WATER POWER A PUBLIC UTILITY.

There was a time when water-power development was considered a local, private enterprise in which only the local community was interested and only the local community had to do with its regulation. This theory has long since been exploded, and it is now generally admitted to be a public utility by all.

Mr. Chairman, water power produced from falling water is, to my mind, our greatest natural resource. Unlike coal, oil, gas, wood, and other fuels, it is not consumed by use. It is a subject not too small for our best minds to deal with. It is a subject sufficiently intricate to demand our best attention. Constitutional lawyers and theorists have in the past differed about it and upon it, but the people of the country have been interested in only three things: First, good service; second, what should be paid for that service; and third, what is to be done with the money derived from that service. Up to this time no adequate, well-defined water-power policy has been brought forward and installed. A great and pressing demand for a solution has been present in the country for the last decade. It has been postponed already too long; this Congress should act.

To me, as I scan the growth of electrical energy and the various and multiplying uses of the product, no question coming before Congress has so much reason to expect that our attention will be riveted upon it. The stability of water power and the perpetuity of its blessings and beneficent influences can now be but partially fathomed or understood; we can but await in amazement for it to outstrip our expectations and fondest hopes. Every line that is incorporated in this bill should be analyzed, scanned, and understood by every Member of this House. What we do here is not for a single year, but for a term of 50 years. It is thought necessary to scan carefully the appropriation bills which are but for a single year. This legislation should be scanned 50 times as closely as an annual appropriation bill, due to the tenure of the law. If we make a mistake in an annual appropriation bill it is a mistake for a single year, but if we make a mistake in our water-power policy it is a mistake for 50 years. Hence, though our constituents might through generosity condone our error on an appropriation for a single year, it will require 50 times that generosity to excuse us for an error we make in our water-power policy, which extends for 50 years. The subject is of high importance; the necessity for action is great; further delays are so harmful that I urge with such earnestness as I have at my command that Congress now take up this task and deal with it carefully, painstakingly, effectively, and correctly. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced at the beginning of this session and is identical, save and except a few unimportant committee amendments, with the bill that was considered during the summer of 1914 and which passed the House August 24, 1914. This House at that time passed the bill without any roll call, and while there was some limited opposition to it, it was very small on both sides of the aisle.

The bill this year, as before, receives the hearty indorsement of the present Secretary of the Interior, the indorsement of the ex-Secretary of the Interior, and I may say that it received then and still receives the approval and commendation of the best students of water power in the country.

Last year we held hearings and for weeks and weeks took testimony, to the amount of 771 pages. Bankers and financiers from New York who financed the existing propositions were before us; also water-power people who developed these powers in the West were before us; electrical engineers from all over the United States were before us, giving us the benefit of their experience, of their information, and of their knowledge on the subject. The committee spent weeks and weeks in careful consideration, and brought this same bill into the House in the summer of 1914. It was then considered by the House section by section; every conceivable sort of amendment was offered, and every Member of the House who cared or knew anything about water-power came in to present his views. As a result of all that consideration, both in the committee and in the House, the bill in its finally completed form passed without a roll call, and, we may say, practically by unanimous consent.

Prior to 1901 there was no legislation at all on the water-power proposition. There were, I believe, some lax rights-of-way laws which afforded a method of disposing of the lands. Water-power sites worth millions of dollars were patented as a part of the homestead and went to patent under the lax land laws then in existence. On February 15, 1901, 15 years ago, Congress awoke to the fact that the water-power sites of the country were slipping away and that something ought to be done. They passed at that time the so-called revocable permit law, under date of February 15, 1901, and the debates there were had at that time show that Congress intended soon thereafter to pass a suitable and fixed water-power policy. Fifteen years have elapsed and nothing has been done. Each Congress has convened; each Congress has heard the appeals of the Secretary of the Interior and the administrative officers of the Government; each time Congress has heard appeals for a development and conservation of the water power that is going to waste; and each time Congress has turned them away. Congress should no longer neglect the water-power situation in this country. It is a question not too small for the busiest man to think about. It is one of the biggest, burning questions of the country. I repeat that prior to 1901 there was little or no law on the subject. Water-power sites valued at millions of dollars, now being figured in millions, with utility boards fixing the rates, passed into private ownership at \$1.25 per acre.

The only other law on the subject is a right-of-way act that was an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill of March 4, 1911, which had mostly for its purpose the development of water power and rights of way on forest reserves.

Of the approximate 28,000,000 potential horsepower known to exist in the United States, only 6,000,000 has been developed, leaving 22,000,000 horsepower in the United States totally undeveloped and for the time being going to waste.

I do not know how the House may feel about it, but some say that we have coal enough to last us an indeterminate period and therefore we should pay no attention to the water power. I deny that that is the correct logic or the correct theory. I deny that any such theory will hold water, because coal used as fuel is totally consumed and can never be used again. It is not so with water power. When water power is used the water is neither despoiled in quality or diminished in quantity, and the falling water making its descent down the mountain side can be used from one turbine wheel to another and later used for irrigation or domestic purposes on its way to the sea.

Some may desire to know why it is that only 6,000,000 water power out of a possible 28,000,000 has been developed. I think it is due to three distinct causes. First, the inefficient and inadequate laws on the subject; second, the control of the market by securing franchises; and third, to the capital that develops water power and the concentration that exists among them which refuses to put any additional capital in for development purposes and thus place in competition additional capital with the capital already invested.

As has been said, the bill provides for a 50-year lease and retains the fee title to the water power in the Government of the United States. A 50-year term seems to be an agreed term. Ex-Secretary Fisher, present Secretary Lane, the forest reserve people, who have had a good deal to do with water power, and water-power engineers, who appeared before us, all were of the opinion that by retaining the fee title in the Government of the United States it would require a term as long as 50 years in order to get proper development and a proper expenditure of money. So I think every member of the committee, and every one

who came before us, agreed that the 50-year term was a proper term. Both Secretaries of the Interior, whom I have mentioned, and, in fact, every one for the last 15 years by annual report, by public letter, by public speech and utterance, have urged the Congress to do something, have urged the several Congresses to pass a law that will really develop and protect the water power of the country. I repeat each Congress has heard them and each Congress has turned them away.

Let me leave a few facts with you. Twenty-eight private corporations in the West own more than 50 per cent of the water power developed in the West. Six of those 28 control 56 per cent of the water power themselves. In the State of Montana, and there has been some large development there, one company owns more than 97 per cent of all of the water power developed in that State.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to how much of this power is developed and how much is under their control in undeveloped power?

Mr. FERRIS. The hearings disclosed that the Montana company owns 97 per cent of all of the developed power in Montana and that they hold almost as much undeveloped holdings in coal storage to head off competition as they have developed.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the instance cited previously by the gentleman respecting the 16 corporations, does that represent developed power or holdings of undeveloped power?

Mr. FERRIS. They represent developed power, although they also have large holdings of undeveloped power. The Utah Water Power Corporation controls over 70 per cent of all of the power developed in Utah, and the same company owns about 30 per cent of all of the power developed in Colorado and 20 per cent of that developed in Idaho. They claim to have and the proofs show that they have large holdings besides that.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman, some time before he finishes, refer to the proviso beginning in line 22, on page 2, and ending in line 8, on page 3, for the purpose of explaining it?

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman does not mind, I would like to take that up under the five-minute rule. I am now just making a few general observations, and I will be glad to take that up with him later, when we reach it in the bill.

I do not mention these things to alarm anybody; I do not mention it to inject any unfairness into the debate, but I merely mention it to show the pressing demand that something be done, so that nineteen or twenty million undeveloped horsepower do not lie idle indefinitely because Congress fails to do the thing which it ought to do—to lay down an adequate, workable water-power policy. The hearings before the Public Lands Committee disclosed that some few estimated that there are 200,000,000 potential horsepower in all the States, but I think that is entirely too high and not borne out by later and more carefully compiled facts.

A specification has been made up by States of where the power is located in the United States, and perhaps the House would like to know where it is. I have incorporated it, but will refer to it partially here. The North Atlantic States have 2,200,000 horsepower, or 7.9 per cent of the total. The South Atlantic States have 2,300,000 horsepower, or 8.2 per cent of the total. The North Central States have 1,700,000 horsepower, or 6 per cent of the total. The South Central States have 1,500,000, or 5.3 per cent of the total. The Western States have 20,400,000 horsepower, or 72.6 per cent of the aggregate.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I want to inquire of the gentleman, Who measured this horsepower, who ascertained what it is, and whether these figures are entirely reliable?

Mr. FERRIS. The figures are from estimates and information gathered by the Geological Survey, put in form and compiled by the Bureau of Corporations, set forth in their report of 1912, and also from Moody's Manual and from investigations made by the Department of Agriculture, which was directed by congressional resolution to secure the facts.

Mr. KENT. Aided by the Geological Survey?

Mr. FERRIS. And, as suggested by the gentleman from California, aided by the suggestions of the Geological Survey.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The aggregate results of these various investigations are to be found where? In the gentleman's report?

Mr. FERRIS. You can find some of it in our hearings and some of it in our reports, but you can get the first facts on the subject, and the facts from which we get these, from the Geological Survey, in the Interior Department, the Agricultural Department, from Moody's Manual, and from the Bureau of Corporations. I have heretofore incorporated them by tables and they will appear as part of my remarks.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How long has it taken to get these figures?

Mr. FERRIS. The first water power that was ever built, hydroelectric-power plant in the United States, was in 1890.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I mean how long has it been since this investigation began?

Mr. FERRIS. The Geological Survey made a report in 1908, which was the initial information of value. It has been going on for a number of years, but this report was brought up to 1912 by the Bureau of Corporations, and even later compiled, verified, and worked on by Mr. Merrill, the chief engineer of the water-power division of the Forestry Department. The greatest credit should be given these departments for their unstinted work. I, for myself, and my committee make grateful acknowledgement to them for their help on this work.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Can the gentleman give his figures for the State of Alabama separately?

Mr. FERRIS. I had them in the hearings, and I could turn to them and look them up. I have them of every State in the hearings, showing the exact amount of potential water power and the exact development of water power in every State, and, as I said in the beginning, of course the potential horsepower is not fixed. The evidence of one engineer would say that in the State of Alabama there was perhaps a lesser potential horsepower, while another might say there was a greater horsepower. But you can get the best estimate of all potential power and can, of course, be exact as to developed horsepower. I have already inserted the figures the gentleman desires, and they will appear in my remarks.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman's statement and figures quoted are estimates as to the potential horsepower?

Mr. FERRIS. Those I gave just now. That is both the navigable and nonnavigable streams. I want the House at least to get this fact, that 72.6 per cent of all water power, both navigable and nonnavigable streams, is in the western group of States, and in that group of States the general public has 330,000,000 acres of public lands, and 165,000,000 acres in the forest reserves, so it is not a matter of minor importance with which we are dealing. I had called to my attention the other day the controversy which is going on in the city of Portland between the Portland Light & Power Co. and the public utility board, and I find that the unearned increment on their plant was put into the utility board at approximately \$11,000,000, a site that probably left the Government at \$1.25 an acre. I do not state that figure as a fact. It was obtained under the old law. So it is not too small a question for the best thinkers on either side of the House to give to the question of water power. The Committee on Public Lands, without throwing any bouquets to ourselves, stayed here every day during the holidays, with the exception of Christmas and New Year's Day, in an earnest consideration of this proposition, and that is why we are able to bring to you early in the session at least the result of our best conclusions based on the experience and opinions we could get. It was not a selfish matter; the committee has labored unselfishly and untiringly in the matter. The only law on the subject of water power is the revocable permit law passed 15 years ago, which was only intended as a temporary proposition, and each Congress for the last 15 years has refused to do anything more. The great majority of Congress, I think, has been willing to do it, but they have allowed other matters to press in and push it aside; but that should no longer be done, for this is one of the largest questions with which this Congress can deal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. For instance, of the 72.6 per cent of available horsepower in the Western States, to how much of that percentage will this bill extend?

Mr. FERRIS. Perhaps I can not give it, but I would say that of the total potential water power in the engineering estimates there are 28,000,000, and of that in the whole United States only 6,000,000 have been developed, leaving from nine-teen to twenty-two million that is in existence—that is, the

most conservative engineer says that there is in existence nine-teen to twenty-two million of water power running to the sea and totally wasted every year, and something ought to be done about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. That hardly answers the inquiry I propounded to the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not intend to evade in any way the gentleman's question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am sure of it. I know that full well. What I desire to ascertain is the extent of the undeveloped or potential horsepower to which this bill will apply.

Mr. FERRIS. The Geological Survey is of the opinion that the following is a fairly correct figure:

The following estimates represent essentially the water-wheel installation that could reasonably be made without extensive storage in 11 Western States using public lands in whole or in part for the em-
placement of water-power plants:

	Total horse- power.	Horse- power re- maining undevel- oped.
Arizona.....	1,850,000	1,820,000
California.....	7,500,000	6,770,000
Colorado.....	1,400,000	1,240,000
Idaho.....	5,000,000	4,870,000
Montana.....	2,750,000	2,690,000
Nevada.....	110,000	108,000
New Mexico.....	120,000	120,000
Oregon.....	2,750,000	2,680,000
Utah.....	800,000	720,000
Washington.....	6,000,000	5,540,000
Wyoming.....	650,000	645,000
Approximate total.....	28,930,000	27,200,000
Horsepower remaining undeveloped.....	27,200,000	
Developed on public land.....	1,730,000	

Of course, in dealing with potentive power figures of different engineers will always be at variance, for it is of course im-possible for each measurement to be the same, taking them at different periods of the year when the streams' flow differ. I will say that three-fourths of the 6,000,000 horsepower now de-veloped is on private land and one-fourth of the 6,000,000 now developed is on public land. Of course, this bill is not intended to have to do with navigable streams or streams that properly come under the Board of Engineers in the War Department. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] and the Interstate Commerce Committee brought in a bill last year, and probably will again, dealing with that phase of it. What we are trying to do, gentlemen, is to bring in a bill that will serve the interests of the public and at the same time will get more development of the power sites on the public lands and in the forest reserves in the West that are now lying idle and dormant.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is one matter—I suppose I could look it up as easily as the gentleman, but it is easier for me and the members of the committee if I ask the gentleman—

Mr. FERRIS. I will answer if I can.

Mr. ADAMSON. In regard to the large amount of water power on the public domain, does that consist mostly of small water-power possibilities, or are there many large propositions on the Federal domain?

Mr. FERRIS. I think you will find it is both kinds. Prior to 1901 we allowed water-power sites, dam sites, to go to patent as parts of homesteads. In other words, the qualified home-STEADER could step up to the land office and say to the register, "I desire to file on the northwest corner of section 32, township 3 north, range 15," and he had the right to file on it. Fourteen months thereafter he had the same right to go back to that same register and pay \$1.25 an acre and offer proof of resi-dence and get title to it. So this water-power site, worth mil-lions of dollars, could go to patent and private ownership, be-yond control, beyond effective regulation, and without any com-pensation to the Government or the community other than to the lucky fellow who chanced to acquire it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think the gentleman misunderstood my question. I earnestly desire the development of the water power of the United States, because I believe that the pros-perity of our country depends more largely on that than on anything else.

Mr. FERRIS. I know the gentleman does.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what I want to know is, and what the members of the committee want to know is, are there many

large possibilities on the public domain; are the possible developments mostly small ones?

Mr. FERRIS. I wish to say that Washington City to-day has a number of people trying to get authority to go ahead and improve them, and some of them are large ones. The topography is rough, the falls rapid, and there are both large and small ones.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are they not mostly small possibilities?

Mr. FERRIS. I should say so; but as to horsepower, I should say not. There is 72.6 per cent of the total power in the United States in the 17 Western States.

Mr. ADAMSON. What proportion of the sites?

Mr. FERRIS. I will put in my remarks the status of developed and undeveloped horsepower, and I think it will serve the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am talking about what are not developed. How many undeveloped sites are there on the public domain where could be developed 40,000 or 50,000 horsepower?

Mr. FERRIS. I will put in my remarks by States, so the gentleman can see it. Of course the engineers differ some in totals, but we can get at it pretty closely.

Mr. KENT. In reply to the gentleman from Georgia, I will state that when we talk about our sites representing 40,000 horsepower, or upwards, those are extremely large. I do not believe, from my knowledge of the work of those who have estimated these power sites, that they have taken into account the vast number of small power sites suitable for the domestic needs of a small community or a small group of people. I do not think that the gentleman will find that those are estimated at all, and there are immense numbers of them. When he talks about 40,000 or 50,000 horsepower he is getting into large figures, and I do not think there are many of those on the public lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will my colleague yield? In my recent visit to California my attention was called to a large number of water powers in the Yosemite National Park held by some private companies and not developed. Can the gentleman from California give us some estimate of the undeveloped water powers in his State to which this bill will not apply by reason of their entry under the act of 1901?

Mr. KENT. I can not.

Mr. FERRIS. I will put in my remarks the developed and undeveloped power by States. The measurement will be by horsepower rather than by sites.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In the present state of the science, can the gentleman tell how far water power can be transmitted practically by electricity? Can he tell how far it is being transmitted?

Mr. FERRIS. We have the judgment of the best engineers in the country in these hearings. And, if the gentleman will pardon me, I will say that that is constantly being improved upon by storage batteries. When hydroelectric power was in its infancy it was thought that they could only carry it a short distance. They are constantly enlarging that, and that is one of the very matters that causes engineers to differ as to the total potential power in the country.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is it now? About how much?

Mr. FERRIS. About 300 miles; or, between two and three hundred miles.

Mr. KENT. I wish to say that the original high-potential development occurred in California. The whole thing was based on high voltage, and at the beginning of the development they found that they could successfully economically transmit power 200 miles under very high voltage. They have continually increased the voltage, and therefore decreased the waste, and thereby extended the length of feasible transmission.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I have recently read that the limit was 200 miles.

Mr. KENT. It was more than that.

Mr. FERRIS. Some of the engineers give it as 200 miles, and that was in my mind, but I repeat that that is the very thing that modern science is experimenting with, to halter this power and carry it to where they can use it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. As to Niagara, can the gentleman tell us how far that power is being transmitted?

Mr. FERRIS. I guess it is not transmitted at all on this side, but is being used on the other side. I am not familiar with that. It does not come under the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. On both sides it is being transmitted more than 100 miles.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not the best evidence on that, because we have nothing to do with Niagara. That is being investigated in another committee and is not under our jurisdiction. I do not pretend to know much about power at Niagara.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan how far it is from Niagara Falls to Detroit? I ask him that question because before the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was repeatedly said that a proposition was then pending before the Canadian Parliament to permit a company to get its water power at Niagara Falls in order to supply electricity to run the street cars in the city of Detroit.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Well, I would simply guess that the distance is something like 200 miles across. I do not know the exact distance.

Mr. FERRIS. I think you will find that that is the distance that the engineers say you can carry it successfully. I am informed it is being carried 600 miles in California, but I do not know how practical it is.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I have ridden over it many times.

Mr. FERRIS. One of the questions that we shall have to fight out in committee, and shall probably have to fight out here in the House, is the question of whether or not the Federal Government owning the site and the State owning the water, we have the right to charge for the use of the water in the State. Now, there are many patriotic men in the West, conscientious men, and men of careful thought, who contend that the Federal Government ought not to charge anything because the States admittedly own the water and the Federal Government owns the site, asserting that to charge anything would impose a burden upon the people.

Our committee, I wish to say, has adopted no such view. No department of the Government has adopted any such view. Every department is of opinion that, at least, a sufficient charge ought to be made at the inception of the work to maintain and hold control in the Federal Government, so that the water-power sites may not get away into the hands of private companies which could and probably would oppress the people by extortionate prices. For example, in the State of California, where water-power development has gone on apparently faster than in any other State in the Union, two companies own 57 per cent of the water powers in the State of California. A single water-power company in the State of California furnishes power to a dozen cities for light, for traction lines, and for power.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman stated that two companies owned 57 per cent of the water power in the State of California. Does the gentleman mean the power that has been developed, or the power that is as yet undeveloped?

Mr. FERRIS. I mean 57 per cent of the developed power. It is also true that they own some undeveloped power to protect their investment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have often seen the statement made in regard to water powers in my own State, to the effect that two companies own 75 or 80 per cent of it, or a large proportion of it. They do own that percentage of what has been developed, but that is only a small fraction of what can be developed, which has not yet been developed.

Mr. FERRIS. I have the figures, and I will insert them in the Record at the point where I dealt with this subject. The gentleman's question was very timely. The two companies I refer to own 57 per cent of the developed water power in the State of California. They also own a lot more which is undeveloped, which is held in cold storage, so to speak, for the future, for the purpose of beating down competition.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to ask the gentleman a question upon the point that he was discussing before he was interrupted by the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The gentleman from Oklahoma claims that the Government has the right to charge for its property?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. But the gentleman concedes the sovereignty of the State within its territories as to regulation of utilities?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; with regard to charges of royalty in the States, but we expressly disclaim the right to override the State laws in regard to water or the distribution of power where they have a public utility. We also disclaim any intent to override the irrigation laws, or to trample upon the rights

of the West in any way; but on the other hand, with equal force we maintain that it is no part of the duty of Congress and no part of the duty of the Federal Government to sit idly by and let a few corporations in a single State control all the Government water powers and thus enable them to charge what they will to consumers to run street car lines, vehicles, to light the streets, and to supply power to homes and industries. It behooves the Congress to see to it that that is not done. Of course, if the property is in private ownership the Government is helpless, but surely we have rights where the power is developed upon Government land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it contemplated that this control which the Federal Government is to exercise over the water power within States is ever going to get back to the States themselves?

Mr. FERRIS. As to these Government sites, it is not so contemplated, and I would not support this legislation if it did contemplate that. I am not in favor of allowing the power sites that belong to the Federal Government, a subject which is so susceptible to monopoly, ever to pass into the hands of private individuals, whereby they could be used to oppress and torture the people who need light and service at their hands. I do not believe you could get four votes in behalf of that proposition in this House. It has been urged here before and always voted down, irrespective of who urged it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then in that case will not the State become half Commonwealth and half Province?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, that is a thing that we hear on the stump and read about in the newspapers. But what are the facts? The facts are that when you are dealing with power companies you are not dealing with States or States' rights; you are dealing with greedy, thrifty corporations and companies whose net earnings usually reach into the millions every year. I have already incorporated their centralization and earnings in my remarks. If the gentleman will observe them, he will observe they are not so downtrodden.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. May I ask if the gentleman is aware of the fact that a large power plant in the northwest corner of the United States has gone into bankruptcy within the last few weeks? Will not the gentleman admit that it costs something to develop power in most of the States?

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman think that good argument? I can cite the gentleman to the names of railroads that are in the hands of receivers. Yet the gentleman would not undertake to claim that because some railroads may get into the hands of receivers for that reason they should all go free of taxes and proper regulation in behalf of the public.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman admit that the States have the right to tax them?

Mr. FERRIS. I admit that the States can tax their own property within their own borders. We do not admit here that they can tax the property of the Federal Government. Now or at any time I would not support a proposition to allow a State to tax Government property. It would be a dangerous and unwarranted proposition.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not wish to cut the other gentleman off. I am simply trying to get at the facts. I am not going to fight the committee, I can assure the gentleman. I never fight Democratic committees. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman's conduct in that respect is better than mine. No one can attack the regularity of the gentleman from Georgia. I usually support them, unless I am sure they are wrong; then I feel it my duty to oppose them.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman is so amiable in many other respects that he can afford to commit a good many sins of apostasy of that sort and still stand very high in the councils of his party. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I thank the gentleman for his good-natured wit. Has the gentleman a question which he wishes to propound?

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago when he was interrupted, and I want to understand exactly what the gentleman said. The gentleman was differentiating between what the States owned and what the Government owned, and stated that there was a contention that the Government ought to charge for water.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did the gentleman say the Government owned the bed of the streams?

Mr. FERRIS. I said that the Federal Government owned the sites.

Mr. ADAMSON. Of course the Federal Government owns the banks of the streams. Who did you say owned the bed of the streams?

Mr. FERRIS. In nonnavigable streams, the Federal Government. The State has the right to use the water. It is its water. It is not ours; but the land is ours, and our rights are clear as to our use of them.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman means the nonnavigable streams in the public domain, and that the States own the water?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and I may say that the nightmare and the bugaboo that has always existed between State control and Federal control is largely put at rest by the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Chandler-Dunbar case, which I think decides the question for all time to come. It lays down the rule flat that the Federal Government has the right to do with its own property what it desires to do with it, and the will of Congress is sovereign. It is our property. We own the sites. We can use them. We can prescribe for their use; the latter is all we seek to do here. If I own one farm and my neighbor Jones owns the adjoining farm, I have the right to prescribe how my farm shall be used by my neighbor if he desires to use it at all. If the Federal Government owns a public building or a site in my congressional district, it has the right to control that. If it owns a power site in the district of the gentleman from Georgia, it has a right to control and to regulate that. There can be no question about it, and the courts have so held.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will recognize a decided distinction between Federal authority over a public building over which it has sovereign jurisdiction, and its proprietary ownership of land subject to the sovereign control of a State as to utilities.

Mr. FERRIS. That has been an argument often advanced, but each time it has been put to rest by the Supreme Court every time it got at the question, and it decided it finally in the Chandler-Dunbar case.

Mr. ADAMSON. I challenge that statement. The Supreme Court has never decided anything of that sort, and in the Chandler-Dunbar case all it decided was the old, well-recognized truth that the Federal Government has supreme control over the beds of navigable streams for navigation purposes, and those purposes only, and that when anybody else gets into that stream he gets in subject to the supreme right of the Government to do everything it desires in the bed of that stream for navigation without accounting to anybody.

Mr. FERRIS. Disputes are not always fruitful or profitable, but I am quite sure this one will be. I ask the Members of the House to read the decision in the Chandler-Dunbar case. Then they can form their own opinion concerning it, which will be better than taking the opinion either of the gentleman from Georgia or myself?

Mr. ADAMSON. I hope they will read it, and I have heard many public speakers make assertions about it who ought to read it and read it thoroughly. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Present company excepted.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I feel safe to rest my whole position on the Chandler-Dunbar case. It is a delightful decision to furnish balm to both sides.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Suppose the gentleman from Oklahoma should insert in his speech his construction of the Chandler-Dunbar case.

Mr. ADAMSON. I suggest in preference that he print the decision.

Mr. FERRIS. I have no objection to printing it. It was presented in the hearings before our committee, and presented at length, and men were there who tried to give it the same meaning which the gentleman from Georgia now tries to give it, and as the result of a month's hearing every member of the committee, I think, with possibly one or two exceptions, agreed with the Supreme Court rather than with the gentleman from Georgia. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 24 minutes remaining. Mr. FERRIS. I am only going to consume a moment more time. I think the committee has done right in framing section 5, called the recapture clause, and I beg of Members of the House on both sides to read that section carefully.

Section 5, the so-called recapture clause, is the section of the bill that renders this a lease as distinct from a grant in perpetuity. Section 5 is the section that enables us, after the first lessee has had his term out, to get the property back and deal with it free from any claims or fetters or restraints, in the light of 50 years' development.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I hope I may proceed, if the gentleman will pardon me. I think we have laid down the correct principle. The principle in a word is this—I hope the House will get this, because it is important—all nonperishable property, such as land, which increases rapidly in value, shall at the end of the term come back to the Federal Government at actual cost. All perishable property shall come back to the Government at the time the Government takes it over at its fair value. So that in the future, if Seattle, if Portland, if San Francisco, if Los Angeles, if San Diego, or any other city out there decides in the future to own its own light, so that an American home may be lighted for 40 or 50 cents a month as distinguished from four or five dollars a month, the city will not have to pay for a lot of inflated, distorted values in taking back the water power.

I know gentlemen will hold between themselves and the fire some poor pitiful homesteader, and pick his bones to try to inject a sympathetic proposition into this, but this is not a homesteader's proposition. It is the largest sort of a proposition that the American Congress will deal with, this question of water power.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I was going to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I yield to him now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question, because this is a subject in which our people are very greatly interested, and I am trying to get the view of the committee upon the question. I have not had time to read the bill as amended. As I understand, this provides that the Government may recapture at the end of 50 years?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; by paying for the property.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In our part of the country we have this water power developed for irrigation uses very largely. Say, at the end of 50 years, there had been an irrigation settlement developed under this water power and that the Government took it over. Suppose they could not agree with the men who had it and they took it over. Would the Government propose to go into the irrigation business and furnish water to the farmers using it—to furnish water to the various companies and private individuals?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, not at all. There is no intention of that sort at all. The gentleman is erecting scarecrows and chasms of trouble that will never materialize.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If that is not true, and the lessees fail to lease it again, what is going to become of it?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman borrows trouble about something that never can happen. The Government does not intend, at the inception or at the close, to interfere with the use of the water for irrigation, or to do anything more than to use some of the proceeds of the project to keep the irrigation going and further develop the project.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As I understand the gentleman's proposition, it is this: I am asking this question because I want to get information. If our people are satisfied that the proposition in this bill is right, they are for it; but here is the proposition we are facing: Take for illustration the water power on the Columbia River. It is developed under the 50-year lease. As a part of that water-power development, there will be irrigation communities consisting of towns, cities, and farms, and at the end of 50 years, when that plant is taken over, what does the Government propose to do? Does it propose to take over and run the irrigation project; and, if not, what are the people going to do if the water is shut off? If you do propose to go into the irrigation proposition and to furnish power for private purposes, where do you get the authority for the General Government to go into the irrigation business? These are questions that I would like to have answered, and I am asking them so that the gentleman may figure it out and answer them in a way that I can support the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. The irrigationists will be in safer hands with their Government than with monopoly, as far as that is concerned. It will not be a question of who can be secured to run the plant, it will be a case of how to get rid of them. The gentleman from Washington raises the question that I supposed would be raised. In the first place, the Government is anxious that at the end of the term, both from the beginning to the end, there shall be no entangling alliances to extend beyond the 50-year term. If the irrigation is under the lessee of the Govern-

ment, they do it with full knowledge of the fact that at the end of the 50 years Congress is going to step in and assert its full right to do what the interests of the country demand, whether it be little or much for the homesteader or anybody else. The homesteader, the home builder, the irrigationists, and pioneers will appreciate and ask for this legislation as soon as they understand it. I fear it is the power people—already entrenched—who want no competition who scatter the poison.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman has answered the question in the way that I have had it answered before. The question comes up, whether you believe that under those terms you can develop irrigation. Knowing that that is true, do you think they would develop irrigation?

Mr. FERRIS. I am glad the gentleman asks the question, for that is one of the points that I was afraid I should not bring out. The present law is what? It is the revocable-permit law of February 15, 1901, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to revoke a permit without a moment's notice, compensation to permittee, or any other consideration. Instead of that this bill gives them a positive fixed term of 50 years, which will induce capital to come out and develop the balance of the gentleman's sparsely settled country. I may say that there is in this city now, and has been all this winter, a gentleman from the gentleman's own State and city, I think, who is urging this bill with the idea that it will develop the water power in his country. He seems to be a good man and a patriotic man. To be sure, he wants more than I think the House will give him, but he knows what he is talking about, and he is anxious to have this bill passed in order to develop your country. I think it will be a great blessing for the country. I have no doubt that under this law the West will get a great development. The gentleman's question is a proper one. If we are selling a razor that will not shave, you want to know it and Congress wants to know it. Some selfish water-power people who appeared before us said that it would not work; said that they could not develop and could not borrow money under it. But we always hear that said by people when they want to get something from the Government they are not entitled to. These power people, with their spurious State rights claims, have held on to the coat tails of the Government for all these years. But the unbiased, patriotic men that came before us say that they can develop the water power of the country under this bill, and they are anxious to get decent laws passed. I am willing to do all I can for early development. There is nineteen or twenty million potential horsepower lying idle, running from the mountain side to the sea idly, a total waste of that immense power. And the people who own the 6,000,000 horsepower already developed have a monopoly without competition or control. I do not want that condition to prevail. I do not want the Federal Government to sit idly by under lax laws that are not workable and let a monopoly grow up.

Mr. Walter L. Fisher, ex-Secretary of the Interior, in each annual report during his incumbency pleaded for Congress to do something. Secretary Lane in each annual report pleaded with Congress to do something. He has stood in the forefront urging Congress to do something. The President has urged it. Every executive officer who knew anything about conditions has urged it for the last 15 years. Congress has heard them, but has done nothing to remedy it. It is unpardonable neglect to further let the interests of the country wither for want of intelligent action. The bill expressly disclaims any disposition or any intent to interfere with irrigation or to override the State laws or to override the water rights or trample upon your western development in any way. On top of that we provide that the proceeds from the royalty and charges made shall go into the reclamation fund so that your reclamation projects shall not wither and die. What do you want? Do you not want your resources developed? Do you still want to haggle and quibble over an imaginary doctrine called State rights?

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is one question that does not involve a dispute about the Supreme Court. I have not bothered myself much about public-land laws, because the gentleman from Oklahoma has been here and I always went to him for information, and I was willing to take it that way. But the gentleman uses the words "irrigation" and "water power." Does he use them in the same connection?

Mr. FERRIS. How is that?

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman used "irrigation" and "water power" in the same connection a few moments ago. I want to know if he means that all of these large projects ought to be utilized for irrigation rather than hydroelectricity.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, water power is used in irrigation.

Mr. ADAMSON. They are used together?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes. On the bald, barren, worthless lands, as bald as the top of the table, if they can get cheap power and pump water out of the earth and out of the streams and put it upon the lands they will convert them into a paradise as distinct from a desert. You only have to go to California, along that strip on the coast, to corroborate that statement.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wanted the gentleman to explain to the committee that fact—that they generate electricity and run a pump with it and then water the land.

Mr. FERRIS. That is it. That is one of the very important uses it has among the small projects. While out in the West this summer we passed over millions of acres of land that are not worth anything as they now stand. We went right over along that little fringe along the coast of California, and we found the most beautiful productive country in the world, but if you step four feet outside of the irrigable area you get into the midst of white sand that would not produce anything. I am trying to get this legislation through so that nineteen or twenty million horsepower of water power may be developed, so that you will not be in the act of irrigating a few acres, but many, many acres instead. I am trying to get this bill through so that you will put something into competition with the centralized water power already in existence so that American homes may be lighted for half what it now costs to light them. I want to furnish power to the irrigator for one-half of what he now has to pay for it, water to the American farmer for half what he has to pay for it now, power to run your traction lines and other vehicles propelled by electricity for a reduced figure; and I believe it will be an everlasting blessing to the West. I fear you westerners are opposed to a law that will help you; you are contending for fee patents, and it is certain you can not get them.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Before you get too far away from Seattle—

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, we will wander back there.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; let us wander back now. The gentleman mentioned a gentleman some time ago as coming from Seattle; and, of course, the mere fact that he is from Seattle is sufficient guaranty of his standing and reputation. We are both interested in the one particular proposition of whether or not we can develop anything under this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; that is an important question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course that is all there is to it.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, not all.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is the most important one.

Mr. FERRIS. Do not go too far afield. I am not willing to give the water-power sites away to get development, and I hope the gentleman is not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. To do what?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman just stated more than he intended to. He stated it was the only question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I said a most important purpose of this bill is to insure the development of the power.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not so sure that it ought to be put that way. It is important.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, it is important. The question I want to ask is this: Did this gentleman, to whom the gentleman has referred, say that he could develop the water power under this bill as it stands?

Mr. FERRIS. With very few modifications, he did; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was interested in that because I heard this bill discussed for several days at Portland when they had that meeting down there, and we found no one there who had capital or any prospective capital that would do it. What are the few modifications?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to get to that Portland meeting in a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to know those modifications.

Mr. FERRIS. He left a marked bill with me.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Are they in the bill now?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I think perhaps some of his ideas were yielded to, but not all of them.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman has referred to the Chandler-Dunbar case.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the opinion of ex-Secretary Fisher, on page 40 of the

hearings. It is very brief, just four lines, and it is in response to a question which I put to the Secretary.

Mr. FERRIS. I will not have time to take that up. I will let the gentleman take it up in his own time.

Mr. SINNOTT. I would like to get it into your remarks at this time.

Mr. FERRIS. I hope the gentleman will wait.

Mr. SINNOTT. As the gentleman has called that to our attention.

Mr. FERRIS. I will make the admission that I will stand on any version or construction that Mr. Fisher puts on the Chandler-Dunbar case. That ought to be sufficient to satisfy the gentleman. I do not want a fragment of anyone's position put in my remarks.

Mr. SINNOTT. It is only four lines.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want the gentleman to inject that in now. I know what Secretary Fisher said. He says that the Chandler-Dunbar case puts an end to this water-power matter once and for all, and he and the gentleman from Oregon do not agree on it at all.

Mr. SINNOTT. Let me read what he said. It is only four lines.

Mr. FERRIS. I decline to yield for that purpose. The gentleman can put it in in his own time. If the gentleman will put it all in, I will be glad to have him do it. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] a moment ago called attention to the fact that out in Portland this summer they held a meeting and that they were all of one mind, and no one favored this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. FERRIS. What was the statement? Let the gentleman make the statement and I will act on it just as he makes it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I said we found no one out there who had any capital to invest who was in favor of it. There were a lot of them out there who were in favor of the bill. The Government sent a number of gentlemen out there who urged the bill, and the departments were represented, and we had some distinguished Senators there who were very much in favor of the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. I misunderstood the gentleman. I desire to address myself, then, to that part of the convention who are not for it. Those gentlemen who say they want to get the best water-power proposition are a good deal like some of the settlers down in my country. In my country we sell Indian lands to settlers at so much per acre and require them to make homestead entry therefor. Every few months the settlers get together and pass a unanimous resolution that all payments to the Indians ought to be canceled and that they have their land for nothing. It is with that same kind of unanimity they look upon this proposition, and when these water-power people get together it is remarkable with what unanimity they arrive at the conclusion that the Federal Government ought to turn over these water powers for nothing, without charge and without regulation. I hope the gentleman from Washington will not advocate that. I am so sure the Government will do no such thing, no matter who advocates it, and it ought not to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the Federal Government really have this water power to lease?

Mr. FERRIS. They have the sites, without which there could be no power development.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But here is a proposition to take advantage of the Commonwealths and to make portions of them mere provinces; to deliberately choke the Western States into an acceptance of this proposition—

Mr. FERRIS. Not at all. I have never observed any legislation that sought to choke the Western States. Every courthouse door in the Union stands ajar, and the gentleman and his friends can enter there and see to it that the Federal Government does not choke him or them. I believe the Federal Government wants to help you, and I believe you gentlemen in a few years will realize that this bill wants to help you rather than to throttle you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman stand here and say that because the United States Government owns sites adjacent to rivers it proposes to take charge of the water in those rivers which does not belong to the Government?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman does not say that, but says—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does it not mean you are legislating for 11 of the Western States in such a way as to choke—

Mr. FERRIS. Not at all; for the West we have all had the greatest concern and consideration. Most of the Public Lands

Committee are, from A to Z, patriotic, good men from the West. They are for the West, and I am with them when they are right, and it is my duty to be against them when they are wrong. I would like to have the people in my State have everything they want. Every county in my district would like to have a public building, and every hamlet there would like to have a public building; but I could not stand here for a moment and advance such a proposition and say that should be done.

Let me add one sentence more, and then I am through. Water power, the use of hydroelectric power, is only 25 years old. The first hydroelectric plant ever built was in 1890 out in Colorado. The law passed on the question of water-power supply 15 years ago is inadequate; it was not sufficient then, and is more inefficient to-day. Every department since then has urged Congress to change it. We have brought in a bill that will correct it. We think it lays down the correct principle. We have brought in a bill which we think will develop the arid West. We have brought in a bill which we think will help the people in every American home who have to use an electric light, to every man who rides on the street cars, to every man who wants the streets lighted cheaply by fair competition, who wants irrigation at a reduced price. Practically the same bill was passed last Congress; let us pass it again that this important matter may not longer be neglected.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves two minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I do not in general debate propose to discuss in great detail the provisions of the pending bill, for such discussion will be more profitable when we come to consider it under the five-minute rule. At this time I shall confine myself to a discussion of the general principles underlying the bill. Some such discussion I believe should be had at this time because of the determined opposition of the officials of some Western States and certain electric-power companies to legislation of this character.

Although the primary purpose of this bill and other bills which will follow it is to unlock the resources upon the public domain in our public-land States and open them to development as rapidly as such resources can be utilized by the public, it must be admitted that there is a very considerable opposition to the bills from the very States which will be benefited by their passage. This opposition I believe can be ascribed to the following causes:

Misrepresentation to the people of the States affected as to the policy of the Government in the handling of its public lands.

Misrepresentation as to the rights of the public-land States in the lands still a part of the national domain.

Erroneous opinions as to the right and power of the Government to deal with its lands in the manner proposed in these bills.

A misunderstanding as to the character of the power sought to be exerted in these bills.

An honest belief by many that we are attempting to interfere with the sovereign rights of States.

I shall discuss these various propositions in the hope that such discussion may be of some aid in arriving at a correct understanding of these bills and in removing some of the opposition, at least, which exists.

Preliminary to such discussion it may be well to state just what policies are proposed in the pending bill:

First. The Secretary of the Interior is empowered to lease to any qualified applicant under the act any of the public lands of the United States, except lands in national parks and military and naval reservations, for a period not longer than 50 years for the purpose of constructing thereon all necessary works for the development and transmission of hydroelectric power.

Second. That at the end of the 50-year term the lease may be renewed under such terms and conditions as may be authorized by then existing applicable laws, or the properties dependent in whole or in part for their usefulness on the continuance of the lease and which may have been acquired by any lessee acting under the provisions of the act, may be taken over by the Government upon payment of the actual cost of lands, water rights, rights of way, and so forth, purchased by the lessee and used in the business, and the reasonable value of all the other property taken over, excluding any franchise value or any other intangible element, or in case the lease is not renewed or the property taken over by the Government a new lease may be made to a third party upon payment by him to the original lessor of the value of the property as above enumerated.

Third. That for the use and occupancy of the lands included in the lease the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to specify in the lease and to collect charges therefor, which charges in all cases when the power is generated upon the lands leased may be measured by the power produced.

Fourth. The gross proceeds from the leases are to be paid into the reclamation fund, and after they have been once used and

returned to the fund, as provided by the reclamation act, 50 per cent of the same shall be paid to the State within the boundaries of which the power is developed, to be used by such State for the building of roads or support of its educational institutions.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit entry under applicable land laws upon all lands reserved for water-power purposes in all cases where such purpose will not be materially injured by such entry, upon the condition that all such entries shall be subject to the right of the United States and its lessees to use any part of said lands necessary for water-power development, transmission, and so forth.

Sixth. The principal remaining features of the bill are those relating to the control of the development and of rates to be charged to the public. I will not enumerate these different provisions now. Generally speaking, however, I will say that every one of these provisions is only such as a private individual would have a right to make in leasing his private property, in the absence of any conflict with State or Federal law, and that question of conflict I shall take up later.

Taking up these various propositions in their order, I assert that every one of them is within the constitutional powers of Congress and in the public interest. The principal opposition is to the policy of leasing these water powers upon the public domain. It is asserted by our opponents that this power does not exist; that while we may possibly have the right to withhold public lands from disposition, we have no right to lease them.

Notwithstanding the assertion of some western gentlemen, this proposition is not even open to argument. The Supreme Court of the United States has settled it in numerous cases. Our power to lease public lands was expressly decided in the case of the United States against Gratiot (14 Pet., 526), which involved the leasing of lead mines upon public lands in Indian Territory. The power was upheld in plainest terms; and from that time to the present, wherever the question was presented to the court—and it has arisen many times in various forms—the power has been upheld.

I will cite only a few of them: In the case of Light against United States (220 U. S. Rep., 536) the Supreme Court said:

The Nation is an owner and has made Congress the principal agent to dispose of its property.

In Butte City Water Co. against Baker (196 U. S., 126) the court said:

Congress is the body to which is given the power to determine the conditions upon which the public lands shall be disposed of.

In Camfield against United States (167 U. S., 524) the court said:

The Government has with respect to its own land the rights of an ordinary proprietor to maintain its possession and prosecute trespassers. It may deal with such lands precisely as an ordinary individual may deal with his farming property.

Again, in Stearns against Minnesota (179 U. S., 243)—

The United States can prohibit absolutely or fix the terms on which its property may be used; as it can withhold or reserve the land, it can do so indefinitely.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, it is not necessary to refer to the Chandler-Dunbar case which has been discussed this afternoon. That related wholly, as was stated, to navigable streams; but the power of Congress to legislate with reference to its own public lands is expressly settled in the cases that I have cited, irrespective of what the proper construction of the Chandler-Dunbar case may be.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I wondered if the gentleman had found any decision—and I am asking for information on this—defining the meaning of the phrase in our Western States' constitutions and enabling acts preventing a State from interfering with the Government's "primary disposal" of soil? Is there any restrictive meaning attached to the phrase "primary disposal" or the word "primary"? I have not been able to find any decision on that, and I thought that possibly the gentleman might have done so.

Mr. LENROOT. I doubt very much whether there is any decision on it; but it is entirely clear to me that the word "primary" is used in these different enabling acts as meaning that they will not interfere with the jurisdiction of the United States or lay any claim to any of these lands so long as the title remains in the Government. That is what I understand by the meaning of the word "primary."

Mr. SINNOTT. I had in my mind—is there any distinction between the disposal of the soil and the primary disposal of soil or public land? In other words, is the word "primary" used in connection—

Mr. LENROOT. Only for this purpose; it might have been open to the construction that they would claim no control over any land that was owned by the Government at the time the State was admitted into the Union, and therefore the word "primary" was used so as to retain the jurisdiction and right of control upon the part of the State in the public land after the Government had parted with its title.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KENT. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his mind, this matter of primary disposal, so called, does not form the foundation of the abstract of title? If the land was disposed of by the Federal Government to the State, is not that the foundation of the abstract of title?

Mr. LENROOT. That is probably true. And further replying to the question of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOR], I shall refer to the enabling act that he mentions later, but even though I am wrong in any degree with respect to my interpretation of that language, the most that was done in any of those cases was a surrender upon the part of the State to any claim in the public land. But I undertake to say that if there had been none of the ordinances that were enacted by the various Western States at the time they were admitted into the Union, the law would have been exactly the same, because they did not have any title, so far as I know, to surrender, unless it be some of the Spanish land grants to the land within their borders.

It being established that the United States has the right to lease its lands, it follows as a necessary incident that it also has the right to fix the terms of the lease and the rentals to be charged.

At the expiration of the term it has, of course, the right to renew the lease, and it also has the right to lease it to a third party at the end of the term upon the payment to the original lessee of the value of his property in the manner and to the extent that the parties have agreed upon in the making of the lease. It is strenuously contended that the Government would not have the right to take over the property at the end of the term and itself operate it. I shall not attempt to argue that question, because it is unnecessary to do so. No lessee is harmed, if the power does not exist, for his property can not be taken away from him without just compensation, and the provision for the taking over of the property by the Government would merely be inoperative if the power did not exist. It could still renew the lease or lease it to a third party upon paying the lessee for his property.

Granted, then, as it must be, that we have the power to lease, to fix the term and the rentals, the only remaining question of power is as to the various provisions in the bill for the regulation and control of the lessee in his development of power.

The bill provides that provision shall be made for the diligent development and continuous operation of the water power, subject to market conditions; that the lessee shall at no time contract for the delivery to any one consumer of electrical energy in excess of 50 per cent of the total output, except upon the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior; that when the electric power enters into interstate commerce the regulation of rates and control of issue of stocks and bonds shall be vested in the Secretary of the Interior or committed to such body as may be provided by Federal statute; that physical combinations of plants or lines may be permitted by the Secretary of the Interior, but forbids monopolies or agreements in restraint of trade; that sale of power shall not be made to a distributing company for a period of longer than 30 days without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior; that no encumbrance or lien shall be placed upon the property without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

That when a State has not provided a commission or other authority having power to regulate rates and service of electrical energy and the issue of stocks and bonds by a lessee, such regulation shall be vested in the Secretary of the Interior or such other body as may be authorized by Federal statute until the State shall provide a commission or authority having this power.

These are the provisions concerning regulation which have so much troubled some of our western friends. They assert we here invade the province of the State and seek to deprive it of its powers. Nothing could be further from the truth. No power is here asserted that a private individual could not insert in a lease of a private water-power site which he owned. We are not here legislating in our capacity as sovereign, but as a proprietor of lands which we own. We authorize the making of a contract, and the lessee enters into contractual relations with the Government, agreeing to do certain things.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman cares to be interrupted or not.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I will permit an interruption.

Mr. MONDELL. He has just made a statement that struck me as being rather extreme. I think his statement was that the Federal Government attempts nothing in this bill that a private owner could not attempt.

Mr. LENROOT. Concerning these provisions for regulation.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is aware that in all of the States to which this applies no power company need do business with the private owner. They can invoke the power of eminent domain and pay for the property.

Mr. LENROOT. What has that to do with the proposition I have stated?

Mr. MONDELL. It limits absolutely any power on the part of a private owner to put any such conditions in a lease.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman does not get my point at all, although he is a very intelligent gentleman. I stated this, and I will put just his case: If a water-power company in the West chooses to deal with a private owner instead of exercising its power of eminent domain over the property belonging to the private owner, that private owner could make that contract with the water-power company and put every proposition in his lease that we propose to put in our lease, and they would be valid in the absence of conflict with State laws.

Mr. MONDELL. I think they would be valid in the lease, but I think the court would set it aside as being contrary to the best public policy.

Mr. LENROOT. What one?

Mr. MONDELL. To allow the owner of a tract of land to make as condition for the use of that tract of land, which might be an important use, the absolute control of the property. In other words, practically confiscate it.

Mr. LENROOT. It is a matter of contract and agreement.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that no such condition would arise by reason of the fact that under our laws the power company, or any user of water for a beneficial purpose, simply proceeds to condemn if he can not make fair terms.

Mr. LENROOT. I am sorry if I can not get the gentleman to grasp the point I am trying to make. The gentleman and others in the West attempt to make the West believe that we are exercising our sovereign capacity to legislate in the making of these provisions, while I am asserting that we are entering into contractual relations with the lessee, and it does not involve legislating in our sovereign capacity at all. For instance, I said the private individual would have the right to make exactly the same kind of a contract, and he would, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming. For instance, A might own a water-power site and in leasing it make a contract with the lessee as one of the terms of the lease that the rates to be charged for the power developed should be fixed by a board until such time as the State government should exercise its power of regulation of such rates. The lease might contain an agreement that the property should not be encumbered without the consent of the lessor, and so of all of the various provisions contained in the bill. We do not undertake to legislate upon these matters in our sovereign capacity but as a proprietor only; but we choose to exercise our power as such proprietor to protect the public interest to the fullest extent possible; but if any of these provisions concerning regulation and control of power wholly within a State should come in any way in conflict with the laws of the State, then I am frank to say that, in my opinion, the law of the State would control, and the provisions, so far as they are in conflict with the State law, will be inoperative and void, and any attempt to enforce such provisions by the Government could be successfully defended against in any court by the lessee by invoking the superior authority of the State law.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman only mentioned one or two of the conditions in the bill. Will the gentleman say that in the case of a private owner he could make and enforce a contract under lease under which it should be provided that though the State had a public service commission and was fixing rates the power of that public service commission would cease and be of no effect if the company ran a wire across a State line? Would that be enforceable?

Mr. LENROOT. That brings up a question that the gentleman is very well aware we have thoroughly thrashed out in this House at different times, with relation to the right to control the issue of stocks and bonds in companies engaged in interstate commerce. It is exactly the same question of attempting to control the issue of stocks and bonds of railroads, and if we have that power, which is strongly asserted by some of the best lawyers in the United States and in this House—although it is denied by others, it is true—and if we have the

power in the case of railroads we have the same power in the case of hydroelectric companies when they become engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. MONDELL. Assuming, of course, that the running of a power line across a State line is an act of interstate commerce.

Mr. LENROOT. I would be unwilling to argue this question upon any other assumption, because it is so clear that it is interstate commerce when it crosses a State line that I do not think it is open to argument.

In private leases it not infrequently happens that leases contain provisions perfectly valid when made, but become inoperative through the subsequent enactment of laws based upon the police power of the State.

I now wish to take up the causes of the opposition of many people in the West to this bill—I stated in opening what I believed was the cause of much opposition—deliberate misrepresentation as to the policy of the Government in the handling of its public lands. Last September there was held at Portland, Oreg., a Western States water-power conference. At this conference, participated in by governors and delegates from most of the public-land States, resolutions were adopted which I shall discuss a little later, but I now wish to call attention to some of the speeches made at that conference to show how the policy of the Government is being misrepresented to the people of the West.

Senator Smoot, of Utah, was one of the delegates to that convention. I shall not indulge in any criticism of the Senator, mindful of the fact that it would be unparliamentary to do so. I shall merely make one or two quotations from his speech at this conference. He said:

If the Ferris bill should become a law, it would be but the second step in establishing as a Government policy the leasing of the remainder of the public domain. Do you want your children to be tenants of the Government or home-owning citizens.

Again:

What would our fathers say if they could see the operation of this system by which the free citizens are to be transformed into tenants and permittees of the Federal Government, lorded over and taxed without their consent by prefects sent from Washington.

Senator Thompson, of Oregon (a State senator), said:

They are tying up our resources by this slow but sure process, the first steps of which is the leasing of water power, and the second step will be the leasing of the rest of the domain and the bottling up of the entire State.

Now, the fact is that instead of tying up the agricultural resources of public-land States and preventing citizens from securing homes, exactly the reverse is true. There is nothing in any legislation now pending, or so far as I know in contemplation by anyone, that by the wildest imagination could be construed as an indication that the policy of the Government was looking toward a citizen tenantry instead of a citizen home owner. Every acre of land withdrawn because of its mineral value is open to homestead entry, and full title passes from the Government to the homesteader except the mineral deposits designated in the withdrawal. It is true that a man can not file a homestead entry for the purpose of securing a coal mine or an oil well, and much as some people would like that to be possible they may as well give up any hope of that character for it never will be permitted.

We hear much about the bottling up of the West, but a very small proportion of what we hear has any foundation in fact. The only possible ground for complaint is in our forest reserves, but that situation is being rapidly improved, for any injustice which may exist lies not in the policy of the law but in the administration of it. But there can be little ground for just complaint even then when we consider the vast areas of land in these public-land States now open for entry under the public-land laws.

I want to call to the attention of my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and those other gentleman who say that the Federal Government has bottled up all the public lands of the West, that the area of the State of Wyoming is in round numbers 62,000,000 acres. On July 1 of last year there were in this State alone nearly 31,000,000 acres of unappropriated, unreserved public lands, or nearly one-half of the area of the State. Utah has an area of 96,000,000 acres. On July 1 it had 31,000,000 acres of public land unreserved and unappropriated. Colorado has an area of 66,000,000 acres. On July 1 last it had over 17,000,000 acres of public land unreserved and unappropriated. I will not take the time to go through the list of all the public-land States, but anyone interested can secure the information by examining the last report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Moreover, the number of homesteads taken has been greater in the last three years than at any other period in the history of the Government. During that period 139,319 homestead en-

tries have been allowed, which is a greater number than had been allowed during any five-year period previous to that time. There were more acres patented last year under homestead entries than there were for the entire seven years from 1868—when the homestead bill was passed—to 1875.

In view of this record it is difficult to conceive how anyone can in good faith make the statement that we propose to reverse the policy of the Government and make the people of the public-land States tenants instead of home owners.

The only thing that we are attempting to reserve Government title to is certain mineral deposits in lands and water-power sites. This very bill now pending provides for homestead entry upon water-power sites, but for agricultural use only. The reservation of use for a water-power site will deprive no man of a home. Men do not build homes on dams. The reservation of minerals deprives no man of a home. Men do not build homes in a coal mine nor in an oil well. We propose to lease nothing that can be utilized for homes. True, we may deprive some citizens of the opportunity to get rich quick through grabbing these valuable sites and mineral deposits, but they are not, as a rule, the struggling pioneer, the man with his little family, seeking a home.

And let me say, in passing, right here, on a point that has been referred to a number of times, that we claim the power under this bill to exact rental in excess of the value of the water-power site. I want to call the attention of this committee to the fact that Secretary Lane, in the hearing before our committee at the last session, cited one instance alone where a hydroelectric company valued its water-power site at \$26,000,000.

Another cause for the mistaken sentiment of the West is the misrepresentation indulged in as to the rights of the public-land States to the public lands within their borders.

The fact is that the people of the various States have no right to the public lands within their borders; these lands belong to the people of the United States, not to the people of any particular State, and it is our duty to administer them for the best interests of the people.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman admit that the people residing in those States have a better right to those lands than the people residing in other States who do not care to go there to avail themselves of those opportunities?

Mr. LENROOT. No; but they have the same right to avail themselves of those lands. The man in Massachusetts, for example, has the same right to go to Idaho and enter public land as one of your own citizens has any reason to have.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. He has the same right, of course; but he can not get any benefit from it unless he goes there.

Mr. LENROOT. A citizen of Massachusetts is as free to obtain a homestead in Wyoming as is a citizen of Wyoming. We believe that the public lands should, wherever possible, be devoted to the making of homes, and that such policy is the best for all the people of the United States. It is true that in the Eastern States we have made no distinction between the passing of title of the public lands to secure homes and the passing of title for speculation or for the benefit of monopoly. But because those who have gone before us have been remiss in their duty, have improperly administered their trust, is no reason why we should make the same mistake. But more than that, the people of every one of these public-land States have by solemn ordinance expressly renounced any and all claim to the public lands within their borders—I shall not take the time to cite all of them, but only one or two by way of illustration.

In the constitution of the State of Wyoming, adopted in 1889, is found this language:

The people inhabiting this State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof.

It is also provided in the constitution that this, together with certain other provisions, shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of Wyoming.

The constitution of the State of Utah, adopted in 1895, provides, in part, as follows:

The following ordinance shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of this State:

First. Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship, but polygamists or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Second. The people inhabiting this State do affirm and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries hereof.

In view of the solemn obligation entered into by the people in the various States at the time those States were admitted into the Union, and in view of the fact that it was made a condition of their admission to the Union, it does not lie well in their mouths at this time and at this day to claim before the Congress of the United States that the lands within the States ought to belong to the people of the States and that they have the right to them. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the right of these public-land States to equality of treatment with the Eastern States. If they mean by that that if 50 years and more ago there was mismanagement of the public domain in the Eastern States such mismanagement should also prevail in the Western States, I can not follow them, nor will that idea be followed by the intelligent, patriotic men of the West. But while they cry out that they are being discriminated against they are asking us to do for them what has never been done for any Eastern States. They have asked Congress to turn over to those States all the public lands within their borders. That has never been done for any Eastern State. In the water-power conference held last September, which I have referred to, they ask Congress to make all public lands subject to the right of eminent domain. That has never been granted to any Eastern State. Others ask that all or the greater portion of the proceeds of public lands be paid to the States in which the lands are situated. That has never been done for any Eastern State. In fact, we are now more liberal to the Western States than we have been to the Eastern States. Until very recently all of the proceeds of public lands with the exception of 5 per cent went into the General Treasury. Now it goes into the reclamation fund, for the benefit of the West. This very bill now pending gives 50 per cent of the proceeds of these leases to the State in which the property is situated as soon as it is repaid into the reclamation fund, after once being used.

Again, some very able men in the West believe that we are attempting to control and appropriate the water in the streams of the West. If there was any foundation for such belief from the language of the bill which passed the House last session, there is none in this bill, for we not only disclaim expressly any interference with water rights which now exist, but we make it clear that the charges to be imposed are rentals for the land used, which, when the power itself is generated upon public land, may be measured by the power produced. Here we exercise the right of a private proprietor to base the charge upon anything they choose, and the only distinction between our proprietorship and that of a private individual is that if it was private property a power company could condemn it under the right of eminent domain, but they can not do so as long as it belongs to the United States.

Much has also been said about the leasing policy depriving the States of taxes. Just the contrary is true. Development under a leasing policy will open up new avenues of taxation. It is well settled in the courts that the States may tax all improvements upon the land that are personal property; they may tax the output of the mine; they may tax the leasehold interest; or they may, through a State income tax, tax the income of the lessees of the Government. This leasing policy will increase the taxation revenues of the State, and, more than that, the entire proceeds from the leased properties go to the development and upbuilding of these public-land States.

Why have we put in this bill provision for the control and regulation of rates and service in certain cases? In the first place, in so far as interstate commerce is concerned, we have the right in our sovereign capacity to regulate those matters, and so long as we do not exercise that right as a sovereign we may do so as a proprietor in the manner provided in this bill. There can be no conflict of authority, then. So far as purely State business is concerned, we only propose to regulate when the State fails to do so. Just as soon as the State acts and regulates them we withdraw by the terms of the bill from the field. Most of the States now have commissions to regulate these corporations, but some have not. The State of Utah is one that has no regulation whatever.

And let me say right here, with respect to the State of Utah, that some of the most determined opposition to this legislation comes from that State, including its governor and other officials. The State of Utah makes no attempt to control any public-service corporation within its boundaries. It has no public utilities commission, and when they ask us to turn over the public lands within the State of Utah to be administered under the State laws they ask us to turn over the public lands of Utah to that great power monopoly which exists in the State of Utah to-day, because under the laws of Utah as they exist to-day that power company could then condemn these very lands under the right of eminent domain.

I have now covered, I believe, the principal provisions of the bill. I sincerely hope that it will become a law at this session. It will open up the resources of the West to legitimate development and prove a blessing to its people. True, a few men will not be able to become enormously wealthy without the investment of any capital through its provisions, but the legitimate capitalist and the honest investor will find security and protection in it. I sincerely hope that the hostility of certain people in the West and of certain water power corporations will not be able to defeat it as they have in the past, but those who are of the belief that if this bill is defeated legislation of the character demanded by the Western Water Power Conference will some day be enacted are very greatly mistaken. The sooner the people of the West realize that the United States will never part with the absolute title to these water-power sites and coal and oil deposits upon the public lands the sooner will these great resources be utilized.

Legislation along the general lines of the pending bill will be enacted, if not at this session then at some time in the future, and if the resources shall remain locked up in the future let it be clearly understood that the people of the public-land States are alone to blame. [Loud applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TILSON. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's exposition of the bill. Reaching section 15, I find a proviso which, after repealing laws in conflict with this act, provides that the provisions of the act of February 15, 1901, shall continue in full force and effect as to lands within the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks in the State of California. I ask why that exception is made?

Mr. LENROOT. Because we exclude these parks from the terms of the bill.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; that is just the question. Why are these excluded when other parks and other public lands are not excluded?

Mr. MANN. The House did it last year.

Mr. LENROOT. The House itself did it. It was done upon the floor of Congress. They desired some legislation in reference to it, and accordingly the bill of 1901 was left to apply.

Now, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] reserves the balance of his time, 13 minutes. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amused at the attitude of certain people from the West. They pretend to speak for all the West. I think I can speak for a little of the West myself. I was the first man in the State of Nevada as a landowner and a stockman to fight for the enlightened policy of leases or permits on the forests. To-day the State of Nevada is unanimously in favor of the preservation of those forests, although they may have no trees in them. My district in California contains nearly 40,000 square miles and has in it vast areas of public domain in and out of the forest reserves. I hear no word of State sovereignty or Federal oppression from my 90,000 voting constituents.

I am amused at the attitude of some other gentlemen, including one gentleman who is particularly hostile to the idea of the public control of anything, who came before the Committee on the Public Lands and asked for a municipal coal mine for the city of Grand Junction, Colo.—a piece of socialism that we conservationists had never thought of forcing upon the State of Colorado. We granted him his municipal coal mine and blessed him for his idea. I for one urged an appropriation to make good the depleted tax roll of his State. [Laughter.] Now, a gentleman in another body has been particularly hostile—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. When it is understood that we have something like 9,000,000 acres of coal in the State of Colorado which is being held up and not used and is withdrawn from entry, does the gentleman think it is socialism or otherwise than good citizenship to give relief to the cities which are now paying \$6.50 for coal when they paid \$2 before?

Mr. KENT. I can not allow the gentleman to take up my time by making a speech. I am not afraid of being called a Socialist; the Socialists honored me by giving me their nomination in the last election.

Another gentleman from Colorado who occupies a seat in another body that is unfit to mention in this House under the rules of this House [laughter] came before us and said he wanted a public park in the State of Colorado.

We said, "Splendid. We will give the State of Colorado this mountain park."

He said, "We do not want a Colorado park; we want a Federal park." And before he finished his argument he admitted that he disliked bureaucratic control, but loved bureaucratic appropriations. And we shall find that running through the whole plea of State rights in this House that the people who make the loudest clamor for State rights are the first people who come in and call loudest upon Uncle Sam for help.

Now, when they talk about alienating these lands to the several States, while I have no time to go into detail, I can mention a few cases where States have been more recalcitrant in the performance of their duty than has the Federal Government. The State of California had been granted by the Federal Government the swamp and overflow lands in the Sacramento Valley. The State sold these lands at \$1.25 an acre under the proviso, I believe, that \$2.50 should be paid for their reclamation. Not one thing has ever been done or a dollar spent, and those lands are in private ownership and will be made worth two or three hundred dollars an acre when an adequate system of improvement is adopted, largely at State expense.

The Federal Government gave to the State of Nevada 3,000,000 acres, and Nevada permitted the location of those acres wherever the purchaser wished, in blocks as small as 40 acres. The State of Nevada gave those lands in any quantity, from 40 acres up, to anyone who wanted them. The result has been that most of the water in the State of Nevada has been taken over; that most of the springs are in private and exclusive ownership by those who acted with the full authority of the State of Nevada. That is the way the State of Nevada has been skinned and skimmed.

Now, when we talk about this horrible policy of tenancy and leasing, I want to bring to your attention the fact that the State of Wyoming grants grazing leases, a thing that is more abhorred by our gentleman from Wyoming than any other crime against nature and the Constitution in all the long list of conservation sins which he so verbosely decries than any other possible conservation suggestion. The State of Texas also grants grazing leases.

And now a word about what we ought to do with some of our water power in the public domain. The water power in the forest reserves is under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. A gentleman from Alabama, now a member of a body unfit for our consideration, shed many tears on the floor of this House over the fact that the water powers of his State might be utilized for extracting nitrogen from the air and thereby fertilizing the fields of his State, and that they were not developed simply because we insisted upon control. I asked this gentleman from Alabama to state, if the proposed grantees should be permitted to use these water powers to extract nitrogen from the air, to make cyanamid or other chemical fertilizer, what price would they ask. He admitted that it would be just a trifle below the Chilean price of nitrates, and the people who manufactured that cyanamid in Alabama would pray the Lord, and possibly lobby in Chile, to have the export taxes of Chile raised so that they could make a larger margin of profit.

I should like to see the time come when the Agricultural Department, either through agencies under lease, or directly, would manufacture this needed fertilizer and serve it out to a barren country at what it costs the Government, plus a profit if it were done through an agency. We can use these water powers in a thousand different ways for the public welfare if we merely hold our grip on them until we can make proper terms. Men have come to this House and asked the privilege of accepting our terms, and thereafter of investing immense sums of money in the production of hydroelectric energy. Their efforts have been blocked simply because of what is called "the danger of a bad precedent." Before I became a member of the city council of Chicago, I applied, through my friend MANN, then an honored alderman from my ward, for the privilege of putting pipes under the streets to connect up three of my buildings, so that I would need only one steam plant and one electric plant. As a matter of common decency and justice I offered to pay rental for the privilege to the city of Chicago. The matter was referred to the committee on streets and alleys South. Hon. Bathhouse John Coughlin was chairman of that committee, and he finally told my friend MANN, "JIM, I will do it for you; but I don't do it for no money for leases to be paid the city; that is a bad precedent." [Laughter.] He was capable of frankly adding that the aldermen needed the money more than did the city. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 4 minutes of his 10 minutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HEFLIN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kernit, W. Va.; and

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the final report of the Joint Committee of Congress to Investigate Rural Credits.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado and Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that I am going to take only a moment or two at this time. I expect to briefly discuss the leasing proposition generally on the succeeding bill—the coal bill—rather than on this water-power measure. I have prepared a minority report on the coal bill (H. R. 406), and I contemplate going somewhat into the details of the policy at that time; but there are one or two things to which I wish to call attention at this time.

It has been very vigorously proclaimed here that the West needs unlocking and that our development is at a standstill. To a certain extent that is true, for this reason: We have now only the right-of-way temporary-permit law for the development of water power. Capital can not and will not invest under a temporary permit revocable at the whim of some petty Government official. The water-power sites of the West are withdrawn from private entry, and as long as the Government follows that policy and refuses to grant to anybody the ownership of the sites or a permanent tenure for the development of water power, of course there will be little or no development of water power. If the Interior Department would revoke those withdrawals and grant permanent rights of way upon and under express conditions preventing monopoly and reserving the right to regulate charges, rates, and service whenever the State public-utility commissions do not properly perform that service, there would be as much water-power development as there is any demand for. I think many of our power companies are in the hands of a receiver now.

Reference has been made by the last speaker to our coal situation.

The coal lands of the West have for several years been withdrawn from entry, and where they have been classified they have been valued so high that nobody will or can buy them. The result of that has been to enhance enormously the value of the private coal holdings. It has given the coal companies a Government-made monopoly that no other power on earth could have given them, and it has permitted them to raise the price of coal from \$2.50 a ton to \$6.50 and make millions of dollars off of the consumers by reason of this conservation policy. That is conservation of the people's money in the pockets of the large coal companies.

If it is true that the water-power companies have very largely gone into combinations, it is also true that nearly all the Western States are adopting efficient public-utility laws that are regulating the prices and service, and it does seem to me that in the end the regulation of the rates and the charges and the service and all those things pertaining to power and the use of coal and fuel generally and light are going to be in the hands of a public-utility commission of the States; and if the States do not perform their duties, the Federal Government would be justified in reserving the right to do so.

Let me say this in behalf of the governors of the Western States that have been referred to: For the past four or five years they have held meetings, at which they have discussed these subjects, and they have repeatedly said they were opposed to any monopoly or waste and do not object to any reasonable regulation, so far as preventing monopoly, waste, or extortion is concerned, or so far as regulating rates and service by public utility commissions. They object on principle to this permanent withdrawal and Federal leasing policy. They vigorously insist that it is not right or fair to our Western States.

What the West objects to in a nutshell is this: We insist, first, that our States were admitted into the Union on the same terms and conditions as the other States and have the same rights that

the older States have. None of the property within your States has ever been withheld from private ownership and taxed for the benefit of the Federal Treasury. You have no right to prevent our resources from going into private ownership and going onto our tax roll to help support our State and county governments; second, the West is poor; you have no right to tax the West to support the East; and, third, you have no right to control our local domestic affairs by sending Federal employees from Washington out there to regulate us. We do not like bureaucratic control. We do not like long-distance government. That is what we object to. We object to our States being treated and exploited as Federal provinces. We believe our commonwealths are sovereign States, and that we have the public spirit and intelligence and as much right to control the resources in our State as you have in your State. Because, forsooth, you have the power on the floor of this House and in the Senate to pass this bill and to regulate our local affairs, we do not concede that that gives you any moral, equitable, legal, or constitutional right to do so.

Of course our people want development, and some of them are willing to accept almost anything that gives any hope of development. But Colorado has never yet instructed or authorized me to surrender her birthright for a mess of pottage. I hope this bill may bring about water-power development and benefit the people, but I do not believe it will.

Talk as you please about taxes where property is held by the Government, we can not tax it. Why should we be compelled to support our State government by taxing only a part of our lands and part of our people? We have as many State institutions as you have, and only about one-quarter or one-third of the territory of our Commonwealth to tax. Why should we allow all this valuable property to be forever withheld by the Government of the United States, and we be prevented from putting any taxation upon it for the support of our schools, our State government, our county government, our courts, our roads, and the development of our country generally?

As a matter of fact, we must go down into our pockets and foot the bills for maintaining the State and county governments and the courts that administer the laws that protect your Federal officials that you see fit to put upon us. We must maintain the schools and build the roads the Government agents use. The whole Federal leasing proposition is absolutely unfair and an outrage upon the West. It is exploiting us as a Federal province or insular possession that we object to. This has never been done or attempted before in the history of this Government, and we are emphatically opposed to this un-American policy. That is the plain proposition. Because you have the power, because there are coal mines and water-power sites on our territory, you say we will hold them in Government ownership, put taxes upon them as we see fit, and use the taxes where we see fit. You say that you are giving the funds temporarily to reclamation service. Of course, that is a benefit to the West. The funds will be used in that fund for from 20 to 30 years and then one-half go into the Federal Treasury and one-half into the State treasury; and yet I fear there is not a man on the floor of this House who will ever see one dollar of it go into the State treasury. It is now that we need the money. It is this generation which needs the taxes. We need more than royalties. We need the taxes on these resources to build roads, to support schools, and to develop the country. It is not the next generation; the next generation will take care of itself. It is the present poor and undeveloped West that needs your encouragement, rather than being deprived of our resources and being taxed and penalized and governed by Federal employees, because we have not the power to prevent it. That is the position we are in.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is there any provision made for the identification of the money that goes into the reclamation fund?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; nobody can tag the dollars that goes into that fund. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this matter further in detail, but, as I said before, I will take it up at length when the coal bill comes up.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. If the money going into the reclamation fund can not be tagged, does not the gentleman think that the State will get one-half of all that is paid in?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope so; but I do not believe that any one of us here will ever live long enough to see a dollar of it get into the State treasury. At least, I fear not.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that the State of Illinois ought to have had one-half of the proceeds of the sale of the public lands of that State?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The State of Illinois has got all her land in private ownership and on the tax roll.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not answer the question. I ask him whether he thinks the State of Illinois ought to have had one-half given to it by the General Government of the proceeds of the sale of all the lands of that State?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is not a parallel question. We are willing, after it is used once in the reclamation fund, to give the Federal Government all the proceeds of the sale of our lands. The money will, of course, then go into the Federal Treasury the same as the funds did from the sale of the Illinois lands. But that is not a drop in the bucket compared with the amount we lose in taxes by the land being perpetually withheld from private ownership.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not answered the question, but the question itself is a complete answer to the gentleman's argument.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Flood having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bill of the following title:

H. R. 3681. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Tulsa, Okla.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had approved the following Senate joint resolutions and bill:

On December 17, 1915:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to transfer the Government exhibit from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to the Panama-California Exposition, and for other purposes.

On December 18, 1915:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Fiscal Relations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

S. 696. An act authorizing the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Oil City, Venango County, Pa.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before I begin the discussion of the provisions of the bill I want to pay a little attention to the artistic straw man skillfully constructed and decorated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], after which he proceeded very adroitly to spar with the straw man and pierce him through. His straw man was his assumption that the people of the West believe that they own the lands within the borders of their States, or have a superior claim upon them. I have lived in the West a long time and I have never heard any such claim asserted by anybody. What the people of the West believe, and what the people of all of the Union wherever there was public land have always believed, is, first, that each of the States of the Union came into the Union on an equality with the other States, and whenever anything is done or attempted to be done which destroys or disturbs that equality it is our duty to resist it on behalf of our own people and for the good of the country as a whole. We further believe, as the Supreme Court has in substance declared, that the Federal Government is the proprietor of the public domain, in trust for all the people. We believe that the man who has the highest right to the public domain is the man from any part of the Union who takes the trouble to go to the public land and take upon himself the privations and hardships necessary to reduce that land to a useful and habitable condition. As that man, and others like him, becomes a resident of a public-land State when he does those things, it is true to that extent that he and all citizens so situated have a superior claim to the part of the public land to which they attach their claim, and to the proper use of the adjacent lands.

Their claim is certainly superior to that of the man who, resting comfortably under his vine and fig tree back East somewhere, does not do the things or undergo the hardships necessary to make the public domain habitable, useful, and valuable. We are not standing on any foolish claim that we own or have a superior claim to the public lands, but we stand as the defender of the rights of those already on the ground and those who shall some time come to assert and affix their personal rights to the public domain, or to certain portions of it, under the laws of the land, even as our people have done from the foundation of the Government. The position we take is the position that has always been taken by those who from Ohio west have attempted in the new States to maintain that equality of condition and op-

portunity guaranteed by the Constitution and enjoyed by the citizens of older States.

I am against this bill because I am against the principles, or lack of principles, that lie at the foundation of it, and I am against it for those reasons.

It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers but by their distribution that good government is effected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson. I am also against it for these reasons:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution are few and defined. Those which remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects as war, peace, negotiations, foreign commerce—with which last the power of taxation will for the most part be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all of the business which in the ordinary course of affairs concerns the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the States.

Those are the words of another great Democrat, James Madison.

These two declarations, if they are accepted as a proper rule and guide, condemn this bill and every feature and factor of it. Let us see what it is. It affects only States where there are public lands. Therefore it affects now about 16. It affects to a considerable extent only about eight—the Mountain and Coast States. It affects within those States only such water-power development as must use some part of the public lands, either for the power plant or some part of it or for the carrying of a transmission line. It is, therefore, sectional as to the States it affects. It establishes different conditions even within those States as between powers which may be located side by side, the one wholly or partly on public land or wholly on private land but perchance running a transmission line across a narrow strip of public land, the other wholly on private land. On those power plants which are affected it proposes to lay a tax, not based in any way on the value of the Government property used, but based on the total productive capacity of the plant. To illustrate, a plant producing ten, twenty, thirty, forty thousand horsepower may be located entirely upon private land, no part of its plant on or near public land; but in sending a transmission line across the country, 10, 20, 30, or 40 miles away, it may be necessary that the line cross a narrow strip of public land, possibly a quarter of a mile in width, and immediately forthwith and thereupon the Secretary of the Interior or some clerk of his, under his authority, may levy and assess such charges as he in his wisdom, or lack of wisdom, may desire to do, based on the entire horsepower development of that great plant. The tract of public land crossed may not be worth \$5. The use of it by a transmission line may in no wise affect its use for other purposes, and yet the very fact that the line crosses it makes it possible to assess a sum against that power plant that may run into tens of thousands of dollars per annum.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Is the gentleman aware that under an amendment of the committee printed in the bill that condition of affairs could not arise, because no such authority is granted the Secretary to charge for water power unless some part of the power is generated on the land used?

Mr. MONDELL. Whereabouts is that?

Mr. LENROOT. On page 7.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee, that being the case, has had some little eleventh-hour conversion that might well have come long, long ago, because this same committee, or another committee having the same title, assured us a year ago that this bill was absolutely perfect in all respects; and when I presumed to make a few remarks relative to it I came very near being accused of being an undesirable citizen.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MANN. I notice section 8 and a committee amendment, and I can not see myself how it makes very much distinction in the bill, but the original bill as it passed the House only authorized specific charges for power developed and sold or used.

Mr. MONDELL. Sold or used.

Mr. MANN. That was charged for the power developed and sold or used; development, sale, or use.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad the gentlemen who have been supporting this measure are now reaching a point where they are entering their pleas in confession and avoidance.

Mr. MANN. Do not include me in that class. I think the Government ought to have control where the lines may run way

above the ground, where the wire does not strike the ground at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me say this: I have not had time to carefully investigate the amendment to which the gentleman from Wisconsin refers, but, looking at it hurriedly, I doubt if it will change the character of the legislation, and I am still of the opinion that the bill as it will be administered will have exactly the effect that all of its sponsors have heretofore up to this good hour claimed it would have, to wit, that all that was necessary to do to trap one of these power companies, no matter how enormous were its holdings elsewhere, was to have a little public land reserved somewhere which it must pass a power line over, and I am still inclined to the opinion that that is true. If it were not true, why are we reserving a lot of these so-called power sites? Some of them are not so located that anyone will ever build a dam or power plant upon them, because the land adjacent to the stream on which the dam would be built, which the waters would flood, on which the plant would be built, have long since and years ago passed into private ownership. So-called power sites have been reserved which consist of strips of land lying back of the streams so situated that it is impossible to develop power along the stream without some minor work connected with the plant passing over the land, or a conduit or pole line to carry the current to the customers of the company.

Now, if it be true that the committee has entirely about-faced and the Secretary of the Interior has entirely changed his mind and that the only plants to which this law applies are those that actually have their works built on public land, then there is no special reason why our friends the extreme conservationists should particularly plume themselves over this legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Because in that event it will only affect a few plants outside of those that may be located on the forest reserves; few plants, in my opinion.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman did not understand me to say that the bill now relates only to public lands upon which power is developed. What I did say was that the charge based upon power developed will only be made where the power is developed upon public land. In the case of a transmission line the charge will not be made on the power developed and is not, in fact, being sold to-day by the department, but based upon a mileage basis.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, there may be some amendment recently adopted since I was before the committee that will effect these changes, but from a hurried reading of these amendments I am still inclined to think that the bill is not materially different now from what it was last year. What has been claimed for it all the time? Its most enthusiastic friends have been particularly enthusiastic about it because it was a sort of water-power catchall, under which, by retaining large acreages, sometimes in narrow strips, in public ownership it would be possible to trap water development, and by so doing be able to lay a charge upon the development measured by the water-power development on plants scores or perhaps hundreds of miles away and located on private land.

But it has only one objection. Taxation is bad enough, heaven knows, when it is inequitable and inequitably burdensome, but there are even worse things than taxation in this world. One of them is the denial of those principles on which the Government, which you have sworn to defend, is based; and if this bill does not run squarely contrary to the Constitution of the United States then there must be some devious winding pathway through that ancient instrument which up to this time no one has been able to find. This masquerades as a bill to lease the public domain for water-power development. To a fair proposition of that kind I have no serious objection. Though I have very strong views about the limitations of the Federal Government's control and ownership of public lands, I am not one of those who believe that the Federal Government is without authority to lease its lands. I have come to that conclusion with a good deal of hesitation and some misgivings. I still have some fear of its effect on the Republic, on the States and their citizens, not in their business life so much as in their political affairs and relations.

If all that was involved in this bill was the matter of making a reasonable charge for the use of the public lands for power development, I should not particularly object. I should not seriously object if the charge were a considerable one considering the value of the lands so used. I should want it based and bottomed on the value of the property, and, of course, it ought not to be unreasonable, the value of the property considered,

But that is not this bill. That is what it pretends to be, but that is not what it is. It is a measure that, assuming a right on the part of the Federal Government to lease its lands rather than sell them, further assumes that, having done that, the Federal Government can do a great variety of things in the way of taxing and controlling domestic corporations which, if done, does not leave the States in which it is done or their citizens in a position or condition or equality with the balance of the Union.

Now, I am a believer in local self-government, sometimes called State rights. I think that Brother Bartlett, of Georgia, before he left us said that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was, after himself, the next best Democrat, from the viewpoint of preserving the rights of the people to control their affairs, on the floor, and he named me as third. But I am not so insistent about State rights that I would quarrel with any provision that went to the limit of the Federal power up to the point of encroachment upon the rights of the State if it were entirely clear that no harm could come to the country by so doing and it was necessary for the public good. Harm will come, however, when you attempt by statute to disturb the equilibrium, the poise, the balance, the division of powers as between the people and the States. I still believe with the famous Democrat whom I quoted a few moments ago that the best way to have good government is to leave local affairs with the people. I know that there are a lot of folks who feel differently. The curious thing about it is—

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that about woman suffrage? [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; the gentleman thinks that about woman suffrage. The gentleman thinks, of course, that each of the States, of and by itself, should give women the right to vote and would benefit thereby. The gentleman also believes that the Constitution very clearly provides a way whereby the States can determine the matter through a constitutional amendment, and therefore it is entirely proper to invoke that method under the Constitution, in accordance with the Constitution, to bring about this great good, which, if accomplished, would settle a lot of these things that now trouble us.

When, however, you proceed on the theory that nothing but the salt of Federal control will save a people locally, you have by that token indicated your lack of confidence in the principles on which our fathers founded this Government. If the people of the States of this Union are not competent, if they are not disposed to, if they will not regulate and control and protect themselves against their own domestic corporations, no salt of Federal control exercised in a pump-handle way from Washington will ever save them. [Applause.] That applies not only to this bill, but to a great many things that are proposed here.

There seems to be great fear in certain quarters that the people of some States will not prove capable of self-government, and our attention is drawn to the fact that the State of Utah has not a public-service commission. I think it is the only Western State that has not. I assume it is due to the fact that up to this time the public-service corporations have been treating the people there so well as to rates and charges that they have not considered it was necessary to have further regulation. We did not have a public-service commission in my State until last year. But I pay no more for electric energy in a little town of 1,200 people in northern Wyoming than I pay in the Capital of the Nation, under Federal control and jurisdiction. [Applause.]

Not only does this bill burden the people through the ownership of public land, but through the medium of that ownership it attempts to set aside under certain conditions the sovereign power of communities to say what they will pay for their electric current. Assume a considerable power plant in the northern part of my State furnishing the current to light a very considerable little city and to run the street railway. Assume this is done at a rate less than we pay here under Federal jurisdiction and control. Assume that this plant and all its lines and property are on private land. Under this bill if it extended its line across the State border, particularly if in doing so it crossed a little public land, neither the county commissioners of the county nor the city council of the city nor the public-utility commission of the State of Wyoming would have anything to say about the rates or practices of that plant. But down here in the Interior Department would be a clerk, who perhaps had never gotten beyond the Potomac or across Rock Creek, and therefore was fully informed, who would proceed to say how the people should be served by that company and under what terms and conditions they should pay for that service.

Now, that may be good legislation in the minds of some folks. If I were a rampant, raging Federalist, who believed that

bureaucracy was the acme of perfection in human government, and that centralization was the cure of all evils, I would be for that very thing, and I would want to vote for this bill.

I want to suggest to some of the brethren who do not live in the region to which this applies, that if we adopt this principle in the West, of course it must be applied to all the development on the navigable streams throughout the country, for surely there is no one here who would say that what is sauce for the western goose should not be sauce for the Middle and Eastern States' gander. If it is right that the Government shall, through some attenuated theory, control, tax, and eventually own, as is contemplated by this bill, water powers of the country; if that is the idea that appeals to us, then, of course, we should have it, not only on this bill, but on a bill to come in a little later, relating to the navigable streams.

I have said that this bill applies only to certain States. The people of those States have been accused of being selfish in demanding things that no one else has demanded or secured. I deny that. But the western people have been a unit, practically, speaking through their governors and speaking through their representatives at meetings in Denver, Salt Lake, Portland, and elsewhere, in their opposition to the principles of this bill.

In so doing they believe they are standing not only for their rights—bless you, no—but standing also for the right of American Commonwealths to remain on an equality each with the other. In their attitude against special taxation and bureaucratic control the western people think they are defending the rights of all of those who may come from Massachusetts or from North or South Carolina or from Mississippi or New York to those new States to find there opportunities under conditions familiar to them, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and not conditions applied as though, as the gentleman from Colorado says, the West were a Federal province.

We believe in sane conservation; we believe in the development of our resources in a way to make them most serviceable in the public interest. We believe in preventing waste, and above all things I want to impress this on you, that we of the West believe in the public control of water-power development. If there is any place on earth where that control has been denied or shall be denied, it can not be in the States to which this bill applies. Here in the East you adopted the common-law rule of riparian rights, and under that rule I understand there are conditions under which those using water power to generate electricity have been disposed to question the complete control of the public over all matters of operation, rates, and charges.

That may be true in the land of riparian rights. But this bill refers to the land of appropriation. The very basic principle of our law relative to the use of water is that the water belongs to the people, that no right to water can be acquired by anyone at any time, except the right to use it for a beneficial purpose, at a given place, for a certain purpose. [Applause.] And over that use the public, owning the water, has absolute and unquestioned control. So that if there be any place in the country where it is necessary for the strong arm of the Federal Government to be stretched forth because of a denial of the right of the people to control, it can not be in the States of water appropriation, where no one has ever questioned and no one ever will question the right of the community absolutely to control in every way all uses of water.

A good deal has been said at one time and another—more formerly than now, although we hear the echoes to-day—of great monopolies, great concentration of water-power development. It is true water-power development is a monopoly, a natural monopoly, and the tendency is toward concentration; and the curious thing about it is that the concentration movement, which was used to scare the people into belief in this kind of legislation is a movement now applauded and approved by the promoters of the legislation. Gentlemen and conservationists so celebrated as Mr. Pinchot and the Director of the Geological Survey, Mr. George Otis Smith, now call attention to this tendency to concentration to approve it. This very bill provides for it, because, they say, only by concentration, so that the current can be used freely over a large area, can there be the widest and most continuous use, and therefore the lowest rates. And so the argument with which all this began has been dropped and their bogey man, raised by the ultra-conservationists, has, as they become familiar with it, been embraced by them as one of the cardinal tenets of their faith.

Of course the power companies will concentrate. At least they will have arrangements under which they can distribute current over wide areas, and there is no objection to that. It is the best thing to do, provided always that there is absolute, unquestioned, complete public control, such as exists in the States to which this law is proposed and expected to apply.

But it has been said, "You gentlemen should not complain. We are relieving you from an intolerable situation, and it really is not fair and decent of you to complain about it when we are in fact giving you an opportunity to develop your resources."

Well, assuming that our resources are tied up, how did it happen? Mostly the same gentlemen who have been most active in advocating this kind of legislation are those who tied them up or applauded the tying. They appeared before committees away back yonder in 1901, coerced Congress into giving a revocable permit for power development rather than a permanent easement, such as we had granted to other classes of water development. They have since been taking advantage of every law and every lack of law, as one Secretary of the Interior put it, to make it more difficult to secure opportunities for development. A certain distinguished Secretary of the Interior just as he was going out of office, without giving any reason or excuse for it, so far as I now recall, revoked out of hand the rights of some 25 or 30 power companies, many of which had spent large sums of money in development. Some of them, probably most of them, were complying with every requirement of the department. Of course, after that was done the people became suspicious of the temporary permit, and water companies did not like to embark upon enterprises under a law which gave so little security.

Then came water-power withdrawals, withdrawing not generally, as the public has imagined, marvelously valuable sites, where dams can be built and waters impounded and wheels made to turn, but frequently strips or areas of rough land lying along the streams, where the power development may be caught in this Federal trap as they pass their power lines from the stream into the country where they have their market. And between these two conditions—the fear, since the cancellation of the permits by Secretary Garfield without rhyme or reason, so far as I know, and the withdrawals—it has been difficult to develop on or near the public domain. Therefore they say, "Behold, we bring you this opportunity for development."

Well, if this were the only way in which the West could ever be developed, some would embrace it; some have, in despair of other relief; but other and adequate relief can be easily, safely, and properly given.

The situation is entirely simple. There is no difficulty about it. All that it is necessary to do is to reenact the right-of-way act of 1891, so amended as to include within its terms the right of way for water for the generation of power. I have taken the trouble to draft such a bill. I did this some years ago. It slumbers in the room of the Committee on Public Lands. The bill contains, among others, a provision that every grant of a right of way should be subject to the condition that if the right of the State to supervise and control in every way were denied or contested, it would work a forfeiture of the grant.

If that is done there can be no question as to the power of the State to control under such a right-of-way act. There would still remain in the minds of some misgivings as to whether the people of the State will protect themselves—the view that they must have the saving arm of the Federal Government. If that is the view, in Heaven's name let us not stop at this legislation. Let us go the length, all along the line, and by some hocus-pocus, by some maneuvering, get around the Federal Constitution so as to take under Federal control every power development, every public-service corporation, or anything like one under the flag. If that is a good rule we should not stop at any half-way or first-step methods. We should go the length.

In addition to the right-of-way act to which I have referred there are the power sites. They can be taken care of by simply providing that these power sites may be utilized under the right-of-way act, and if the lands are disposed of for other purposes—and many of these lands will not be used for power sites in our time or in a hundred years, and many of them never at all, and there are other uses to which people would like to put them—if they are acquired under the public-land law it shall be with a proviso that if ever needed at any time for power purposes the only cost to the user for power purposes shall be the agricultural value of the land. That cost would not stop, or hamper, or in anywise burden any development anywhere on earth.

I for one am willing to go further than that, and to have the Government write into every patent that is issued a provision requiring an acknowledgment of local control over any enterprise established on that land for the generation of electric energy. I will go as far as the most ardent or ultra conservationist to make State and local public control effective.

We can do these things very simply. They are absolutely effective. They dispose of the whole matter, and they dispose

of it in harmony with the theory of our Government, in harmony with our institutions, and in a way that will encourage and protect development.

To go back just a little, to bring up a point that I hurried over, I wish to say that any legislation which is a fraud, which does something other than that which it is assumed to do or claimed or purposed to accomplish, or claimed to be purposed to accomplish, ought not to commend itself to any wise legislator. This bill, as to some of its provisions, is little less than a fraud. No one now openly denies the right of the States to control the nonnavigable waters within their borders; and yet the Federal Government, which disavows any control, in the paragraphs in the bill before the one in which is written down that self-denying ordinance, proceeds to assert control; and not only to assert control, but to levy its charges on the basis of that control.

Of course I am glad that section in which the Congress disclaims control over the water is in there. It is mouth-filling, and it has helped some of our western brethren to more nearly tolerate this bill than they could otherwise have done. But either that provision has no force and effect as written into this bill or else the other provisions of the bill have no force or effect, and you can take either horn of the dilemma you like. My own notion is that, while that section to which I have just referred does state an unquestioned fact, there may be a way, and it may have been discovered by the ingenious gentlemen who drafted this bill, whereby, through indirection, the Federal Government may be able to do something which it could not do directly and make it stick. That sort of legislation, however, does not ordinarily commend itself to thinking people.

We of the West claim no rights, privileges, or immunities that are not now enjoyed by all the people of the Union. We ask no special favors, though the Congress has been good to us in some respects, as it has been very good to other parts of the country. We are not asking that we shall have any opportunities of development that the balance of the Union has not had, has not now, and will not have in the future. We are just as anxious to secure the benefits of the development of our resources cheaply and in a way useful and beneficial to our people to the highest degree as anyone else can be. Furthermore we think we are not a pusillanimous folk and will not allow our power companies to charge unreasonable rates. Any such suggestion that our State can not control its affairs is an indictment not so much of our people as of your people, because we are of you, and everyone knows that no such indictment can be fairly or properly framed. All we ask of the Congress of the United States is that this question, which is simple, which involves no difficult problems, shall be settled along lines that will enable us to control our own domestic corporations and care for our own people and develop our resources, even as your people have developed theirs from the beginning. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH].

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MANN was recognized.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield for a moment, I would like to see if we can not get an agreement as to closing general debate. I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the time consumed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and such time as he may yield out of his hour, general debate be closed.

Mr. CARLIN. Is there any agreement in existence now as to closing general debate?

Mr. FERRIS. There is none. I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of the time consumed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and such time as he may yield out of his hour, all debate be considered as closed.

Mr. CARLIN. One more question; I have not been in the House all of the time. Has there been any agreement reached as to voting on any amendment?

Mr. FERRIS. No; we have not reached the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman, reserving the right to object, if he is willing to indicate his course in the further consideration of the bill to-day.

Mr. FERRIS. If this unanimous consent is agreed to, I propose to have one section of the bill only read after general debate is closed and then quit.

Mr. STAFFORD. And then consider the bill under the five-minute rule the next Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, I thought we might consider the bill to-morrow and the next day, after the speeches that are for the special order to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. We have Friday and Saturday of this week practically open.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the leaders of the House on both sides are willing to pursue that course.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that after the time consumed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and such time as he may allot out of his hour, that general debate be closed and the bill be read under the five-minute rule. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection, with the understanding that there will only be the first paragraph of the bill read to-night.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; we will not take up the bill for amendment to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume very much time of the committee. The subject of dam legislation, or hydroelectric-power legislation, has been pending in Congress for a number of years. There is, first, the question of the matter of the development of power where the General Government owns the land adjacent to the power, where the streams are upon the public land. That is the matter referred to and provided for in this bill. In addition to that there is the question of the regulation of the construction of dams across navigable streams or in navigable waters, either in connection with or entirely apart from the improvement of the waters. Those matters are in the War Department, so far as the jurisdiction of the administrative end of the Government is concerned, and, in the main, in the House in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, except where they are directly connected with river or harbor improvements, when they come in the river and harbor bill from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. All phases of these matters have been before the House on repeated occasions. When I came into the House and was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the practice was for anyone who desired to construct a dam across navigable waters to have some attorney prepare a bill, which was introduced into the House and referred to that committee. Some of those bills would be two or three sections, maybe a page, long, and some of them would be of many sections and many pages long, all varying one from another in their requirements.

I drew what is known as the general dam act, which is still the law. That is still a subject of controversy. This bill, however, relates only to the matter of the construction of dams for the development of power where the public land of the United States is affected. It is not a difficult thing to understand the principles which are the basis of the bill. On the one hand, where the Government owns public lands, it may by a general law provide a method by which a citizen of the United States acquires the absolute ownership of the land, to do with as he pleases. Of course, if he acquires the absolute ownership he has the power to do with it as he pleases, so far as the General Government is concerned. That was the policy of the Government for many years. Undoubtedly many places where the land, in connection with the development of power, is of immense value were given away by the Government upon what seems to me to have been fairly proper principles at that time. No one knew the value of this land in the future. No one a few years ago could project his mind far enough into the future to understand the great development of electricity and the immense power which could be developed in the way of electrical energy by the use of water falls. We adopted that plan for years. Necessarily it is a monopoly. Wherever the land can be used for the development of power, it is a monopoly necessarily. Whoever has the use of it to that extent has a monopoly. That is in the very essence of the thing. The question has arisen whether the Government should simply give away the use of the land or whether, either by lease or otherwise, it should in some way and to some extent control the use of this monopoly. The bill here draws this distinction. Instead of giving the land away, it proposes that the General Government shall lease the land under terms to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in compliance with the law; but which at any time, as to future leases at least, could be changed by Congress. And these leases are to be for a period not to exceed 50 years. After all, while our friends from the West complain, this bill is in their interest, because out of this bill, when enacted into law, the people of those States will receive a portion of the benefits which the public gets, instead of some individuals in those States, or more likely living in Massachusetts, getting

all of the benefits and the profit out of the use of this monopoly, because it is a monopoly essentially.

Inasmuch as the General Government owns the land in these States, it belonging to the people of the United States, where it is not a question merely of the occupation of the land and the tilling of the soil, which of itself is a monopoly, where it goes to acquiring some great benefit from the use of the land, either by the development of electrical power or by taking some mineral substance out of the land, where the man who had it, if he acquired it for nothing, made great wealth at once, I have for years been of opinion that it were better that this great wealth be partly divided up for the benefit of the people of the United States and partly for the benefit of those States where it is located. [Applause.] And really that is the essence of the bill. We may not all agree about the provisions in a bill of this sort. No two men would ever draw a bill identically alike covering the same subject, but I may say to the new Members of the House that this bill occupied a good deal of time in the last Congress, and was, I think, as thoroughly considered and with as able and determined opposition as any bill since I have been in the House. There was no phase of the propositions involved in the bill which was not considered and debated by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and other very able Members of the House. And the House itself did take action and make some corrections in the bill.

In connection with this matter, however, I desire to say a few words only on the other subject which will come before the House later from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The existing law upon the subject relating to the construction of dams in navigable waters, generally referred to as the general dam act, I drew, reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and aided in the passage of, and it is the law. It provides the terms upon which dams in navigable waters can be granted, the War Department having authority to grant permission in some cases, but generally the permission still having to be granted by Congress. The law now provides, both as to dams and bridges across navigable waters, that if the dam or the bridge is to be constructed in or over a stream wholly within the limits of one State, the War Department has the authority to issue the permit without action of Congress; but that if it is an interstate stream passing from one State to another or dividing two States that law does not apply, and it requires the particular consent of Congress. And the habit here for years has been to pass special bills for bridges, sometimes for dams, referring to the general act of Congress.

We have endeavored to modify the existing dam act. We did it in the last House. We did modify it somewhat in, I believe, the Sixty-first Congress.

I want to refer for a moment to a report from one of the ablest men now in the Government service, a man for whom I have the highest regard, Secretary Garrison, Secretary of the War Department. I have a great deal of faith in his judgment about many things. He is a man of judicial mind. But all men in the Government service, and particularly at the head of departments, frequently get misled by the ignorance of their subordinates. Mr. Garrison in his recent report, at the very beginning of it, on page 3, referred to the failure of Congress at the last session to enact the Adamson bill into law. Referring to the existing dam act, he goes on to say:

The evils of the existing law must be conceded; a consideration of the general dam act itself reveals them, and the lack of development under it in the face of a substantial demand makes proof of them. It is believed that though these evils are now generally understood, their full effect and far-reaching consequences are hardly appreciated. Without specifying here, it can in a word and in all truth be said that the existing law is a makeshift which effectually prevents all development. On the one hand it does not offer the rightful and necessary inducement for an economical and profitable development, nor on the other hand would it adequately protect the interests of the public if development were possible under it. Even were it sufficient in these regards it has been demonstrated that it would be unworkable in another. It is a general dam act in name only; while purporting to lay down general conditions to cover development in all cases, it nevertheless requires in each case the further special authorization by Congress, an inconsistency which invites a disregard of the general conditions, makes of each application an independent legislative proposition, and subjects each project to the delay and hazard of congressional action.

The trouble with an administrative officer here in one of the departments who never before he came here had any knowledge whatever of general procedure or the precedents in Congress is that he frequently makes a mistake and slops over. Now, the same criticism that Secretary Garrison levels against this act might be made against the general bridge act. Yet Congress is not willing, and never will be on the dictum or the request of an administrative officer, to turn over to that administrative officer the absolute and complete power to determine in each case whether it shall construct obstructions over any or across the navigable waters of the United States. Most of the special bills which we pass here are passed as a matter almost of form,

and yet not one of them is ever passed without having some investigation by a committee and having a report from the War Department itself as to the propriety of the action, and Congress will never be willing to let Mr. Garrison, as an administrative officer—which means some engineer whom no one could locate perhaps—to determine whether a bridge or a dam shall be constructed across the Mississippi River or many or most of the other navigable streams of the United States. And we are not going to change our policy because Mr. Garrison does not like it, and does not like it because he does not know anything about it. Nor is his charge correct that the present dam act is bad because there has been no development under it. The general dam act was passed in 1906, and Congress proceeded to pass a number of special acts granting permission to people to construct dams in accordance with the general dam act. There is no lack of application. There were many bills before the committee. We passed a number of them, until President Roosevelt vetoed the James River bill, in Missouri, and the International Falls or Rainy River bill, in Minnesota. Of course, when the President announced that he would veto all bills which came to him we quit passing them. It was not a lack of applications from people who wanted to construct dams. It was the refusal of Congress to pass bills which the President announced he would veto, and I may say in passing that if President Roosevelt had known what was in the general dam act before he vetoed the bill, I do not think he would have vetoed it. He did not know what constituted the law when he sent his veto to Congress. Under that law there was constructed the Rainy River Dam at International Falls. I have never heard of any complaint of the lack of power to obtain money for it. It is one of the greatest developed water powers in the country. I do not know what the horsepower is, but it is an immense plant. They obtain millions and millions of dollars for its development, and although it was constructed under the general dam act, it properly, I think fairly, at least, serves the interests of the Government. When Mr. Taft became President the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had promised Mr. Roosevelt to propose amendments to the general dam act. They were proposed.

I went to the President of the United States and said to him, "We have propositions to amend the general dam act. While I do not think they are necessary, yet I think some of them may be wise, and I want to know if we can find out in advance what will be satisfactory to the President, so that he will not veto the bills that we pass hereafter in accordance with the general act."

All Presidents have the right to change their minds. I have no complaint. President Taft said the changes that were proposed were perfectly satisfactory, and we passed a number of bills in accordance with the changes. There was no lack of applications; but after a while he vetoed one on the recommendation of somebody—I do not know who, but probably somebody who had conservation on the brain but did not know what was in the law. In my judgment, if the War Department had ever properly construed the general dam act, it would be a perfect law. I do not think myself it is perfect with the construction which the War Department put upon it. But Mr. Garrison is mistaken in thinking that it shows there was a lack of confidence on the part of investors. There has been no lack of confidence. In all the history of this Government, so far as Congress is concerned, I do not think there is an instance where men ever invested money, still with Congress having the power to take it away from them by repeal or otherwise, where that power has been exercised. While we have retained control, no one has ever been robbed of his investment by any act of Congress, so far as I have ever been able to learn; and I do not think there is any danger of that.

When the general dam act comes before us again for revision, as it probably will this winter, the contest over this bill will be to-day as child's play compared with the other proposition. There are immense water powers for development on the navigable streams of the United States. Some people believe they ought to be developed wholly in the interest of and for the profit of the men who happen to get possession of the land. I believe that if we have any power over the subject at all—and let me remind my western friends that these navigable waters are not, in the main, in the public-land States—I believe that where we have any control over it at all we ought to protect the interests of the United States and the people of the United States as well as the consumers of the power to be developed. [Applause.] That question, I hope, we may be able to determine at this session of Congress. There is one thing that may interfere with it. Our beloved western friends—and they are all, I hope, my friends, as I am a friend of all of them—have not so much influence in the way of numbers as they have, comparatively, in another distinguished legislative body. I do not know how much may be yielded to them, but if our western friends want

to develop properties, if they want to construct dams and hydro-electric power plants, build up industries around them, and have the power to tax, as they talk about, the investment, which is theirs, and in the end have this money paid into the school funds, which they are not entitled to have, they ought to support this bill in this body and use their influence to support it in the body at the other end of this Capitol. [Applause.]

I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

[Mr. SMITH of Minnesota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, not inconsistent with the terms of this act, to lease to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, any part of the public lands of the United States, including Alaska, reserved or unreserved, including lands in national forests, the Grand Canyon and Mount Olympus National Monuments, and other reservations, not including national parks or military reservations, for a period not longer than 50 years, for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and operating dams, water conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, and other works necessary or convenient to the development, generation, transmission, and utilization of hydroelectric power, which leases shall be irrevocable except as herein provided, but which may be declared null and void upon breach of any of their terms: *Provided*, That such leases shall be given within or through any of said national forests or other reservations only upon a finding by the chief officer of the department under whose supervision such forests, national monument, or reservation falls that the lease will not injure, destroy, or be inconsistent with the purpose for which such forest, national monument, or reservation was created or acquired: *Provided further*, That in the granting of leases under this act the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, give preference to applications for leases for the development of electrical power by States, counties, or municipalities, or for municipal uses and purposes: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of enabling applicants for a lease to secure the data required in connection therewith, the Secretary of the Interior may, under general regulations to be issued by him, grant preliminary permits authorizing the occupation of lands valuable for water-power development for a period not exceeding one year in any case, which time may, however, upon application, be extended by the Secretary of the Interior if the completion of the application for lease has been prevented by unusual weather conditions or by some special or peculiar cause beyond the control of the permittee.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the two speeches which are to be delivered, I believe, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS]—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] speaks Friday, but there are two Democratic Members who are scheduled to speak to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORDLAND] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. KITCHIN. That after those two speeches—

Mr. MANN. Let me make a suggestion. I suppose the gentleman is about to make a request with reference to this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There is a special order for to-morrow, a bill from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads about savings-bank deposits. It may or may not take any length of time. There is nothing on the calendar. Why would it not be fair to give this bill a privileged status and then we can take it up to-morrow, Friday, or Saturday or at any other time?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think that is a good idea, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 408, be given a privileged status. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of this bill, the final vote upon it, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. FREAR, be given one hour in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that after the final disposition of House bill 408

the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be allowed to address the House for not exceeding one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members on both sides of the House who have spoken on the water-power bill have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. For how long?

Mr. FERRIS. For five legislative days.

Mr. MANN. This refers to their own speeches.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is not customary to limit the time for Members to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the water-power bill have the right to extend their remarks, without limiting the time. Of course the remarks to be confined to this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3681. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Tulsa, Okla.

DYESTUFFS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a short article in the RECORD giving the actual conditions in regard to the acute situation of dyestuffs. The article is from the Annual Review of the Journal of Commerce, a purely business publication. It will only take a short space in the RECORD, and Members will want to see it as they may be called upon shortly to vote upon it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to print some statistics that he mentions in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 6, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on reexamination of Calumet River, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Chief of Division of Printing and Stationery, of this office, relative to additional requirements of the Internal-Revenue Service for stationery for the remainder of the current fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for pay, etc., of the Army for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting additional estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 473); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a request for an appropriation of \$100,000 for rural sanitation, to be expended under the direction of the United States Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 474); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting first annual report of the Federal Trade Commission, in compliance with the statutes of the United States (H. Doc. No. 475); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting annual report of all lands reserved for power and reservoir sites within the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana (H. Doc. No. 476); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of all reservations of public lands, made in conformity with the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., 858) (H. Doc. No. 477); to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriations to enable the Government of the United States to suitably participate in an exposition to be held in the city of Panama in January, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy reporting that the Navy Department has considered, ascertained, adjusted, and determined the respective amounts due claimants therein specified on account of damages for which the vessels of the Navy were found to be responsible (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting facts relating to the serious condition of the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., in so far as pertains to the depth of water in ship channels leading thereto (S. Doc. No. 229); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Gotts Island Channel, Me. (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination of Ouachita River, Ark. and La., with a view to excavating a channel from the slackwater pool above Dam No. 6 to the town of Felsenthal (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of channels from Catano Bay to San Juan Harbor, P. R. (H. Doc. No. 482); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination of Caseville Harbor, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on survey, for the purpose of charting only, of Crooked Lake, Burt Lake, Mullett Lake, and other connecting waters, constituting the so-called inland route extending easterly from the vicinity of Petoskey, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 484); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

17. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Rouse Point Harbor, Lake Champlain, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Pond River, Ky. (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hoods Creek, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of channel of Mississippi River and harbor at St. Paul, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of French Broad River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 489); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary exami-

nation of Fisheating Creek, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 490); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Rogue River, Preg bar and entrance (H. Doc. No. 491); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Julienton (Julington) North Sapelo River, Ga., to a point at Laws Bluff (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Sapelo River, Ga., to public road near Eulonia (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7530) to fix the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 7531) granting the public lands within the State of New Mexico to said State and regulating the disposition thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7532) for the construction of a public highway through the Pecos National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 7533) establishing the Wilson Creek National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 7534) to pay Confederate soldiers and the widows of Confederate soldiers the money unlawfully collected pursuant to an act of Congress of July 1, 1862, and acts amendatory thereof, commonly known as the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 7535) to amend Schedule A—stamp taxes—of section 22 of an act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, and extended by House joint resolution 59 to December 31, 1916, and approved December 17, 1915; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 7536) to check the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7537) to erect a monument commemorating the Battle of Kettle Creek, in Wilkes County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7538) to repeal an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and amendments approved February 5, 1903, and June 15, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7539) providing for the disposition of the tax on cotton collected during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1863, to June 30, 1868; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7540) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the United States of America; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7541) to provide that the United States shall in certain cases aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7542) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Eatonton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7543) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Monroe, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7544) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Madison, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7545) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Eastonton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7546) amending the act of May 11, 1912, granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7547) to authorize the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7548) to amend section 2 of an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7549) to establish a fish-cultural station in Shannon County, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7550) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto; and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7551) providing that the United States shall in certain cases make compensation for the use of highways for carrying free rural delivery mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7552) to provide for the securing of deposits in postal savings banks in cities and towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants, by personal bonds or the bonds of bonding companies, when such deposits shall be deposited in national or State banks located in such cities or towns; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7553) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7554) to extend the provisions of the pensions acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with the military and naval forces of the United States in the suppression of the rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7555) providing for pensions for American citizens who have reached the age of 65 years and who are incapable of manual labor and whose incomes are less than \$200 per annum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7556) increasing the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction thereon of a post-office building at Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 7557) for the construction, operation, maintenance, and use of a tunnel through the main range of the Rocky Mountains, under or near James Peak, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 7558) for the erection of a public building at Dodge City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 7559) providing for an appropriation to pay back annuities to the members of the Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians enrolled under the act of March 3, 1893; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7560) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for utilization of water power at locks and dams constructed by the Government on navigable rivers of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7561) making an appropriation for maintenance of improvement and open-channel work on the Bayou Bartholomew, Boeuf River, Tensas River, Bayou Macon, Bayou D'Arbonne, and Bayou Corney, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7562) making an appropriation for continuing work on locks and dams on the Ouachita and Black Rivers and for maintenance and open-channel work on the said rivers in the States of Arkansas and Louisiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7563) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7564) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7565) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Port Orford, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 7566) to improve Los Angeles and Long Beach (Cal.) Harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) to improve Los Angeles and Long Beach (Cal.) Harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 7568) to provide for an annual assessment of real property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7569) to transfer the authority, duties, discretion, and powers of the board of education of the District of Columbia to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7570) to authorize the commissioners to grant leave of absence with pay to per diem employees on legal holidays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7571) to provide for the appointment of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 7572) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7573) to regulate the issuance of stocks, bonds, securities, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness by corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and the purchase and ownership by other corporations of such bonds, stocks, notes, securities, or evidences of indebtedness issued by corporations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 7574) to amend the act of July 25, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," relating to the improvement of the harbor at Monterey, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7575) to pension the permanently helpless orphans of Civil War soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7576) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 7577) to authorize the closing of abandoned highways in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7578) to provide for assessing the cost of roadway pavements in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7579) to authorize the extension of highways through property of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7580) to transfer control over the Washington Aqueduct and appurtenances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7581) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to collect municipal refuse upon default of contractors to carry out the terms of their contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7582) to protect from pollution streams flowing through United States parks and reservations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7583) to abolish the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia and to create a director of charities, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7584) to transfer control over the Aqueduct and Highway Bridges to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7585) to provide for the appointment of the register of wills of the District of Columbia by

the justices of the supreme court of said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7586) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to dispose of the ground known as the "Industrial Home School property," and to purchase ground and erect buildings for that institution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7587) to require the recital of the real consideration in deeds of property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7588) to provide for the appointment of a board of children's guardians of the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7589) to repeal an act entitled "An act for the relief of street car motormen," approved March 3, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7590) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make appointments to positions in the Temporary Home for Ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7591) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7592) to provide for the appointment and removal of employees of the free public library by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7593) to provide for the appointment of a board of trustees of the National Training School for Girls of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7594) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make all appointments and removals from annual and other positions of the Industrial Home School of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7595) to authorize the commitment of convicts to the reformatory of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7596) to require the removal of overhead poles and wires on Georgia Avenue from Florida Avenue to Rock Creek Church Road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7597) to open roadways in the subdivision of Barry Farm, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7598) to enlarge the area of assessments for the opening of alleys and minor streets; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7599) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer land for a public highway known as Nichols Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7600) to regulate the taking of cash retents on contracts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for the extension of Seventeenth Street NW. from Kenyon Street to Irving Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 7602) for the allowance of certain soldiers' claims growing out of service in the Army, reported by the Court of Claims, known as travel-pay claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 7603) to relieve shippers from making oath to export declarations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 7604) to regulate the manufacture of hydrants, hose, and nozzle couplings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 7605) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kingsport, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7606) to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 7607) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to certify to the Secretary of the Interior, for restoration to the public domain, lands in the State of

Louisiana not needed for naval purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7608) to enlarge, extend, remodel, and improve the post-office building at Findlay, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7609) to donate certain condemned cannon to the Fort Harrison Country Club, of Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7610) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of a corporation for the purpose of promoting the commerce of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7611) authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, and approaches thereto, across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 7612) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Norton, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 7613) to authorize the Terral Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River near Terral, Jefferson County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 7614) to provide for national aid to the several States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7615) to amend section 4215 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7616) to provide for the survey of Island End River, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7618) for the acquisition of a site and erection of a building at Algona, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 7619) to repeal section 3 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, enacted July 27, 1892; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7620) to repeal the internal-revenue tax of 10 cents per pound on the manufacture, sale, and use of domestic oleomargarine, and to repeal the internal-revenue tax of 15 cents per pound imposed upon the sale, transportation, and use of imported oleomargarine, and to amend certain sections of such acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 7621) prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 7622) to incorporate the Playground and Recreation Association of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 7623) for the relief of certain purchasers of land under the act entitled "An act to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 7624) to amend section 62 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 7625) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 7626) to amend the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7627) for the establishment of a fish-cultural station at or near Mena, Ark.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 7628) granting to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State, to reimburse the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1868; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 7629) providing for the purchase of lands for a marine post; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 7630) to provide for the payment of the wages of employees in Government institutions while attending drills and cruises of the Naval Militia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7631) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 7632) to provide for a home-stead entry on water-power sites; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7633) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to Hancock Post, No. 464, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Emporia, Kans., two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7634) to place certain officers of the Army on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 7635) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 7636) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7637) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments in the cultivation of apple trees and apples and to establish an experiment station at Cornelia, Habersham County, Ga.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7638) to suspend the collection of the 10 per cent tax on State banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7639) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the ninth congressional district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7640) for the relief of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7641) to construct a national highway in Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7642) to construct a suitable building for the use of the United States court at Gainesville, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7643) for the relief of New Hope Baptist Church, of Bartow County Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7644) to amend the acts to regulate commerce so as to provide that publishers of newspapers and periodicals may enter into advertising contracts with common carriers and receive payment for such advertisements in transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7645) for the survey of Tugalo River, near Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7646) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7647) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Winder, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7648) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Lawrenceville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7649) to construct a suitable building for the use of the United States post office and assay office at Dahlonga, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7650) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Buford, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7651) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7652) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Canton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7653) authorizing the erection of a post-office building in Jefferson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 7654) to retire postal employees on an annuity after 25 years' service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7655) to prohibit discharge of employees from the Postal Service for certain disabilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 7656) providing for the trial of charges against employees in the classified civil service list; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7657) to amend section 1 of the act of Congress of May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: Resolution (H. Res. 77) directing the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives information concerning taxes imposed by foreign Governments upon munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 7658) granting a pension to Elizabeth Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7659) granting a pension to Frank Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7660) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7661) granting an increase of pension to John J. Bradford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7662) granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Hutchings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7663) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wrigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7664) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Hutchings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to Gertrude Schwoerer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7666) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Ayres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7667) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7668) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Andler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7669) granting a pension to John A. McLain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7670) to reimburse D. Dale Condit, of the United States Geological Survey, of Washington, D. C., for moneys expended in the payment of a damage claim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 7671) granting a pension to William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 7672) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7673) granting a pension to Carrie Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7674) granting a pension to Mary J. Cobler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7675) granting a pension to Sara Gates; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 7676) granting a pension to William S. Kemp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7677) granting a pension to James N. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7678) granting a pension to Benjamin B. Glass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7679) granting a pension to John H. Mathews; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7680) granting a pension to William J. Shedd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7681) granting a pension to William A. Senkbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7682) granting a pension to Albert H. Free; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7683) granting a pension to Edward Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7684) granting a pension to William H. Simmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7685) granting a pension to William J. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7686) granting a pension to Pinckney P. Chastain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7687) granting a pension to Willis S. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7688) granting a pension to Eliza A. Woody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) granting a pension to Sanford A. Pinyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7690) granting a pension to Swinfield Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7691) granting a pension to Mariena E. Wehant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7692) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Artamina Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7694) granting an increase of pension to Celia P. Edmondson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7695) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Corbin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7696) granting an increase of pension to Catherine G. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7697) granting an increase of pension to Jackson A. Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7698) granting an increase of pension to Martin K. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7699) granting an increase of pension to Martha Allison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7700) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7701) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McMinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7702) granting a pension to Sarah L. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7703) granting a pension to John L. Holt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7704) granting a pension to Robert Shope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7705) for the relief of James H. Hendricks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7706) for the relief of William J. Cochran; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) for the relief of Joseph M. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7708) for the relief of Mrs. F. E. Chandler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7709) for the relief of Steven Pittman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7710) for the relief of Julius Pickett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7711) for the relief of the heirs of John C. Addison, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7712) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7713) for the relief of the heirs of W. W. Fleming; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7714) for the relief of Benjamin C. Martin, Ezekiel Martin, Henry C. Fuller, Ezekiel Fuller, Eliza L. Crow, and Elizabeth Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7715) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of O. H. P. Wayne; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 7717) granting a pension to Joseph Tanco, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7718) for the relief of the heirs of Capt. Wellington W. Withenbury; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 7719) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Dickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 7720) for the relief of The Peoples Savings Association, of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) for the relief of the Fidelity Building, Loan & Savings Co., of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) for the relief of the Columbus Railway, Power & Light Co., successor to the Columbus Railway Co., of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7723) for the relief of the Columbus Railway, Power & Light Co., successor to the Columbus Edison Co., of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7724) for the relief of the Columbus Light, Heat & Power Co., of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 7725) granting a pension to John D. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 7726) granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 7727) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Binns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7728) granting a pension to Alice B. Homer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7729) granting a pension to Louis Toupin, alias Louis Beaudette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7730) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting an increase of pension to John J. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 7732) for the relief of Paul Walderstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7733) to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and adjudge the claims of the estate of John Frazer, deceased, and of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7734) granting an increase of pension to Surelda Ruge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan W. Cleland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7736) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7737) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Doe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7739) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Gunder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Stansbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) granting an increase of pension to Nannie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7742) granting an increase of pension to George J. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) granting an increase of pension to Marilla Shrieve; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to Agnes F. Ellsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7746) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) granting an increase of pension to George Baumgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) granting an increase of pension to Sanford T. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) granting an increase of pension to James H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 7750) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Utter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7751) granting an increase of pension to O. W. Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7752) for the further relief of Hans Peter Guttormsen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7753) granting a pension to Armina Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 7754) granting a pension to Julia and Katherine Sherwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7755) granting an increase of pension to Frank Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7756) to reimburse Minnie Dillon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7757) for the relief of Frederick J. Fadner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 7758) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Arnau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 7759) for the relief of Patrick Conley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Silas Taggart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7761) granting a pension to Elizabeth Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting a pension to Martha J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7763) for the relief of Stephen J. Simpson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to John M. Panick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) for the relief of Herman Brede-meier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7768) for the relief of Matthew McDonald; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to George H. Dry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7770) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7771) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church of Darien, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7772) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. J. R. Middleton and Elizabeth Middleton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7773) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Samuel Noble, deceased, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7774) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary A. Cameron and John Cameron, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7775) for the relief of the estate of Rev. Moses N. McCall; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7776) for the relief of the estate of Charles Evans, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7777) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Way, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7778) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick R. Wyly, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7779) for the relief of the heirs of M. M. Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7780) for the relief of the legal heirs of the estate of John Chapman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7781) for the relief of the heirs of William B. Hall; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7782) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew D. Kent, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) for the relief of the heirs of Asbury Hodges, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7784) for the relief of Bridget Zeigler, sole heir of John C. Zeigler, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7785) for the relief of the heirs of David Beasley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7786) for the relief of James A. Miller, representative of the heirs of James M. Miller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) for the relief of heirs of Wiley Jackson Kiser, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) for the relief of the heirs at law of the late Joseph S. Claghorn and John Cunningham, both now deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) for the relief of heirs of Samuel H. Haddon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7790) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph W. Dickey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7791) for the relief of F. G. Hodges; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) for the relief of Mrs. W. J. Gross, of Glennville, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7793) for the relief of the Importing & Exporting Co. of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7794) for the relief of J. J. Nease; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7795) for the relief of J. A. Stanfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7796) for the relief of J. B. Shearouse; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7797) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 7798) granting a pension to Emma A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 7799) for the relief of the Cleveland Savings & Loan Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7800) for the relief of the Union Savings & Loan Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7801) granting an increase of pension to Henry Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 7802) granting a pension to Edgar Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7803) granting an increase of pension to Abram Towson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 7804) to authorize the issuance of patent to Oscar R. Howard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7805) granting an increase of pension to Michael Balenti; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7806) granting an increase of pension to Jessie L. Higby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7807) granting an increase of pension to Otis O. Milliken; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7808) for the relief of the widow and heirs of William K. Morrow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7809) granting a pension to Columbia A. Seaman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7810) to correct the military record of William H. McKown and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7811) for the relief of the heirs of Josiah Short; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Minnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 7813) granting permission to Lieut. Col. William E. Horton, United States Army, to accept and wear a decoration tendered him by the President of the French Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7814) granting a pension to Clifford E. Ham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary R. C. Blanchard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 7816) for the relief of Zelma Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7817) to validate the homestead entry of George S. Clark; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7818) granting a pension to Jacob Kuhn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7819) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 7820) granting a pension to William S. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7821) granting a pension to Walter Keating; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) granting a pension to William A. Keating; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7823) granting a pension to William H. Heller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7824) granting a pension to William A. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7825) granting a pension to Cevilla Wise; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7826) granting a pension to Fred C. Sawin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7827) granting a pension to William Shafer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7828) granting a pension to Charles Volz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Harvey O. Zerbe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7830) granting a pension to Paul Kroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7831) granting a pension to Charles J. Keese; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7832) granting a pension to Ella J. Hills; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7833) granting a pension to Albert R. Huey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7834) granting a pension to Mary Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7835) granting a pension to Thomas J. Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7836) granting a pension to Isaac H. Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7837) granting a pension to Cora M. Rowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7838) granting a pension to Susan Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7839) granting a pension to Jane Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7840) granting an increase of pension to Walter E. Hantch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7841) granting an increase of pension to William A. Priar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7842) for the relief of Jeremiah Rader; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7843) for the relief of Herman Wagner, alias Henry Burnett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Jane M. Nettleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 7845) granting a pension to Martha L. Hume; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7846) granting a pension to Joseph F. Zbanek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7847) granting a pension to William H. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7848) granting a pension to Mary J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7849) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Honeywell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hazleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting an increase of pension to Elisha D. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) to remove the charge of desertion against George Hull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 7853) to appoint J. D. Nevin a second lieutenant on the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7854) granting an increase of pension to J. K. P. McClary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7855) granting a pension to Amanda J. Kemberling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7856) granting an increase of pension to Abner R. Bradney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 7857) for the relief of James R. Parmenter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 7858) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Kircher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 7859) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McQuillan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7860) for the relief of Francis N. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 7861) for the relief of The Denver Tramway Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 7862) for the relief of New England Coal & Coke Co., owner of the American barges *Emilie* and *Cassie*, and Bruusgaard, Klosterud Dampskibsselskab, owner of the Norwegian steamship *Hesperos*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 7863) for the relief of the Western Loan & Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7864) granting an increase of pension to Buford P. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) granting a pension to Samuel E. Spencer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7866) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Martin Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7868) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7869) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Blacklock; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7870) granting an increase of pension to William Illingsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7871) granting an increase of pension to Anna J. Bloodgood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7872) for the retirement of John W. Perry, registry clerk in the United States post office at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) for the relief of John James Boston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 7874) granting a pension to Frank E. Dorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) granting a pension to Charles A. Vanatta; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) granting a pension to Jeddo Q. McNatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7877) granting a pension to John R. Barrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7878) granting a pension to N. Benton Yackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7879) granting an increase of pension to Julia B. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7880) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 7881) granting a pension to Arthur C. Dexter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7882) granting a pension to John L. Churchill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7883) for the relief of Charlotte M. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7884) for the relief of the Santa Fe Building Association, of San Bernardino, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7885) for the relief of the San Diego Building & Loan Association, of San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7886) for the relief of the Home Investment Association, of Redlands, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7887) granting a pension to Mary L. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7888) granting an increase of pension to Adam Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 7889) for the relief of the Yakima Savings & Loan Association, of North Yakima, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 7890) granting a pension to Frank Arnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7891) granting a pension to Fess Whitaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7892) granting a pension to Willie E. Terry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7893) granting a pension to Robert McDowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7894) granting an increase of pension to John S. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7895) granting a pension to Dillard Pliman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7896) for the relief of the heirs of Lemuel J. Draper; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7897) for the allowance of certain claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 7898) for the relief of the Hilton Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7899) for the relief of the Woodside Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7900) for the relief of the Reliable Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7901) for the relief of the Commonwealth Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7902) for the relief of the Junior Order Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7903) for the relief of the Twelfth Ward Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7904) for the relief of the Ironbound District Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 7905) granting a pension to Luther L. Kauffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 7906) granting a pension to John W. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7907) granting an increase of pension to Emma Steinmetz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7908) granting an increase of pension to Minnea Stratemeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7909) granting an increase of pension to Homer Moorhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7910) granting an increase of pension to Amasa Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7911) for the relief of George W. Platt; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 7912) granting a pension to Margaret Callaghan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7913) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7914) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7915) granting a pension to Malvina White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7916) for the relief of Louis Wasem; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7917) granting a pension to Taubyna Bourstine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7918) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Garrigus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7919) granting a pension to Bridget O'Leary; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7920) to amend the military record of Carlos Baker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7921) granting an increase of pension to Miron Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 7922) granting an increase of pension to William E. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7923) granting an increase of pension to George H. Twitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7924) granting an increase of pension to William T. Locke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7925) granting an increase of pension to Betsey Sleeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7926) granting an increase of pension to Albion K. P. Marston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7927) granting an increase of pension to Elias A. Lofthrop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7928) granting a pension to Jennie L. Sidelinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7929) granting a pension to Edward F. O'Toole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7930) granting a pension to Will D. Buchanan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7931) granting a pension to Samuel R. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7932) granting an increase of pension to John S. Goodyear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 7933) granting an increase of pension to James McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7934) granting an increase of pension to John P. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7935) for the relief of the United Breweries Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 7936) granting a pension to Henry Ostman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7937) for the relief of S. F. Scattergood & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7938) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stocker, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7939) granting a pension to Andrew R. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7940) granting an increase of pension to William D. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7941) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7942) granting an increase of pension to Joshua M. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7943) granting a pension to Anna S. Duffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7944) granting an increase of pension to Albert Stonehart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 7945) granting a pension to George F. Randall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7946) granting an increase of pension to Perry L. Brumage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 7947) granting a pension to Charles Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7948) granting a pension to Daniel M. Moser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7949) granting an increase of pension to John G. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7950) granting an increase of pension to W. P. Altman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7951) for the relief of David D. De Mott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 7952) granting a pension to Sarah H. Deyo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7953) granting a pension to Ellen Soule; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7954) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Layman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7955) granting an increase of pension to James Feagles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 7956) granting an increase of pension to Arabella Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 7957) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Tirrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 7958) granting a pension to Nathaniel Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 7959) granting a pension to John E. Seeger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7960) for the relief of John W. Hardy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7961) for the relief of Susan D. Fulton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7962) placing Henry E. Rhoades, assistant engineer, United States Navy, on the retired list with advance of one grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 7963) granting an increase of pension to James A. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7964) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Leary; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) granting an increase of pension to Walter McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7966) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Fengler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7967) for the relief of George W. Quick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 7968) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. McCombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7969) granting an increase of pension to Manley R. Yardley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 7970) granting an honorable discharge to James Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7971) granting an honorable discharge to Andrew Jackson Hendrickson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 7972) granting a pension to Orville H. Hammers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 7973) for the relief of Joe Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 7974) for the relief of Edward B. Sappington and William Vane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7975) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan D. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7976) granting a pension to Mary Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7977) granting an increase of pension to James McKoy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7978) for the relief of Squire Simes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7979) granting a pension to Louisa Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 7980) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7981) granting a pension to Laura Newman, née Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7982) granting a pension to David J. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7983) granting a pension to Odillon C. Schupp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7984) granting a pension to Rosa L. Huebner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7985) granting an increase of pension to Charles Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7986) granting an increase of pension to Perry Harris, alias James Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7987) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hotchkiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) granting an increase of pension to W. W. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7989) granting an increase of pension to Charles Montooth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7990) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jansen Oltman, alias Henry Jansen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7991) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7992) granting an increase of pension to Michael Rafter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7993) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Sowards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7994) granting an increase of pension to James Sterns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7995) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Tomlinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 7996) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Underhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 7997) granting an increase of pension to Rollin T. Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) granting an increase of pension to Leander Fufthey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7999) granting a pension to Ellen Fate Tuite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Maxwell Carpenter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8001) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. G. Macnamara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 8002) granting a pension to Isaac B. Almand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8003) granting a pension to May Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8004) granting a pension to William A. Abney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8005) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry W. Beusse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8006) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Williford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) for the relief of the heirs of John M. King, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of the heirs at law of Rosa M. Wyatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) for the relief of the heirs at law of J. R. Welch; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) making an appropriation to pay the legal representatives of the estate of John H. Christy, deceased, to wit: E. J. Christy, Mary L. Christy, Sallie A. Christy, W. S. Christy, T. J. Christy, and Julia H. Bryson, and the estates of J. R. Christy, W. D. Christy, and H. P. Christy, heirs at law of John H. Christy, late of the State of Georgia, in full for any claim for salary and allowance made by reason of the election of the said John H. Christy to the Thirty-ninth Congress and his services therein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 8011) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8012) for the relief of Richard Dove; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8013) granting a pension to Malinda Wesley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 8014) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Byram; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, urging the drilling of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, urging a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Welch Post, No. 422, Grand Army of the Republic, of Uhrichsville, Ohio, in favor of the prisoners of war bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6937, for relief of James Park Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of 48 merchants of Coshocton, Ohio, in favor of the so-called Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6122, for relief of John Favinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Ohio Millers State Association, in favor of the Moss grain-grades bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6124, for relief of George W. Medick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 4869, for relief of Lemuel S. Darr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6939, for relief of John W. Stroup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of Friends, of Philadelphia, Pa., against any increase in the armament of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: Memorial of Pennsylvania Peace and Arbitration Society, favoring conference of American Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of Nashville (Tenn.) Commercial Club, relative to compensation for carrying mail by railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER: Petitions of merchants of Oconomowoc, Hartland, Pewaukee, and Dousman (all in Wisconsin) asking that legislation be enacted to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolutions by the board of directors of the South San Joaquin irrigation district, of Manteca, Cal., approving the bill to authorize the National Government to guarantee the payment of interest upon the bonds of public districts organized for the reclamation of arid, semiarid, swamp, and overflow lands, introduced by Senator Jones of Washington; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition by the druggists of Vallejo, Cal., approving the so-called Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition signed by every drug-store proprietor, registered druggist, and registered assistant druggist of Stockton, Cal., favoring the Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., approving the Sacramento flood-control project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, relative to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of D. M. Frederiksen, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring passage of the Kern-McGillicuddy bill (H. R. 476); to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, relative to appropriation for fighting citrus canker; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Evidence in support of House bill 5008, granting a pension to Cornelius Stellingware; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Albert J. Krueger and 15 others, of Ableman and Reedsburg, Wis., urging passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sparta, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of George W. Bell Relief Corps, No. 3, of Waukegan, Wis., for increase of pensions paid to widows of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Memorial of White Cross Council, Knights of Columbus, of Norwich, Conn., favoring passage of the Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, for an embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railroad mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Merchants' Association of San Jose, Cal., urging legislation in behalf of the oil industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of business men of California, favoring bill to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill 5177, for relief of John W. Beckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of American Oil Development Co., of Marietta, Ohio, against tax on gasoline, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper in support of House bill 5167, to increase pension of Benjamin W. Havner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Welsh Post, No. 422, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring pensions for prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper in support of House bill 5142, granting a pension to Charles F. Coss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, favoring conference of American Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Security League, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Seattle Chamber of Commerce, relative to pay for carrying mail; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Welsh Post, No. 422, Grand Army of the Republic, relative to pay for Union ex-prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Petition of merchants of Pikeville, Ky., in support of House bill proposing to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants of Prestonsburg, Ky., in support of House bill proposing to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants of Paintsville, Ky., in support of House bill proposing to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 156 citizens of the State of Michigan, including employees of the several railroads in Michigan and others, for a law limiting the length of freight trains on all railroads in the United States doing an interstate business to not to exceed 50 cars in any one train and requiring that the train crew consist of not less than one conductor, two brakemen, one flagman, one engineer, and one fireman; also, a law making 12 hours a full day's work for all employees in train service; and that all freight cars be equipped with iron ladders at each corner of the car, with suitable grab irons on top of the car; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of International Association of Machinists, Progressive Lodge, No. 41, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the present preparedness plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to a conference of American Republics for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Ashtabula, Ohio, relative to establishment of an armor plant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Security League of Philadelphia, Pa., urging military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Army nurses of Civil War, Washington, D. C., urging placing of memorial tablets to Army nurses in memorial building; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of St. Stephen's English Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pa., against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Perry L. Brumage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Oliver C. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., indorsing additional appropriations for the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to provide adequate equipment and vessels for Pacific coast survey work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of the National Federation of Implement and Vehicle Dealers, favoring the enactment by Congress of a law establishing an absolutely nonpartisan tariff

commission of commercial experts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Stark County Medical Society in meeting assembled at Dickinson, N. Dak., urging that adequate provision be made in the new organization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, concurrent resolution adopted by the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, urging Congress to prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war from the United States to any of the nations engaged in the European war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) District Medical Society in meeting assembled on December 8, 1915, praying that the Secretary of War make adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for additional medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association in meeting held at Fargo in August, 1915, protesting against the reenactment of certain provisions of the stamp-tax revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of merchants and business men of New Britain, Conn., favoring bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of American Oil Development Co., protesting against tax on gasoline and other petroleum products and upon horsepower, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and bankers of the thirteenth Ohio congressional district, against certain sections of proposed revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Ohio Millers' State Association, favoring passage of the grain-grades bill (H. R. 4646); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John Held and others of the thirteenth Ohio congressional district, against increase of tax on whisky, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of executive committee of the Ohio Stogie Manufacturers Association, protesting against revenue tax on cigars, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Evidence to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Arabella Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the men's bible class of the Presbyterian Church, the men's bible class of the Methodist Church, the men's bible class of the Baptist Church, all of Watkins, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. J. Allen, of Ithaca, N. Y., protesting against the proposed tax on gasoline and automobiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Steuben County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Association of Pacific Fisheries, urging increase of the general appropriation for propagation of the Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to pay for carrying the mail; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Chamber of Commerce of Fulton, N. Y., and Electrical Supply Jobbers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Society of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Manhattan Camp, No. 1, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, and William McKinley Camp, No. 62, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, urging pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Monthly Meeting of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Cape May County seashore resorts, relative to acquiring by the Government of the United States of inland waterways of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protest of H. J. Stohrer and 48 other citizens of Kalamazoo, against any increase in revenue tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of F. C. Emery, of Battle Creek, against increased taxation on tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Woman's Temperance Union of Coldwater, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Williams-Davis-Brooks & Hinchman Sons, Detroit, against the reenactment of the emergency war-revenue act taxing toilet articles and perfumes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 7414, to pension Carl J. Domrose; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7407, to pension Foster R. Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7408, to increase the pension of James Waters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7406, to increase the pension of Mary Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7413, to increase the pension of Philip George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7415, to pension Leo Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5595, to pension Joseph L. Hengel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7412, to increase the pension of Benjamin N. Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7419, granting a patent to a certain strip of land to Elisha A. Crandall; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7416, for the relief of Robert J. Shields; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEDMAN: Petition of sundry citizens of North Carolina, protesting against the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of sundry citizens of East Greenwich, Riverpoint, and Arctic, R. I., favoring bill to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT: Memorial of William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, relative to pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Connecticut Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Association, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 6, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom dwelleth all fullness of life and power, we call upon Thee in the midst of the great and perplexing problems of our national life. We thank Thee that as we come to Thee we are assured of the essential unity of the moral life of this great people, and that we know the strength of our national life lies in the high ideals of the people of this country. Keep us faithful to Thee, the Author of the divine law. Give us reverence for life, that we may not only respect the right to live, but be inspired by the possibilities of a holy life. By Thy grace may we so discharge the duties imposed upon us that the divine plan may be wrought out and great blessing come to all the people. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions of the Polish Citizens' League of Lake County, Ind., expressing appreciation of and thanks for the resolution of the Senate and the proclamation of the President of the United States appointing a day on which the people of the United States were asked to contribute to the relief of the suffering Poles in Europe, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at San Francisco, Cal., favoring the selection of an impartial commission to investigate the Steamboat-Inspection Service, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Drug Trade Conference, held at Detroit, Mich., praying that no amendments to the so-called Harrison antinarcotic drug law be adopted pending a judicial construction of the present law, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.